THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'THE particular problems of the Christian conscience in time of war are but signal instances of the problem inherent in the Christian life,' writes Canon F. R. BARRY in his recent book, *Faith in Dark Ages* (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). The problem of faith he deals with elsewhere, but in his second chapter, 'Christians and Compromise,' he faces the *ethical* problem, and he does so in a challenging and even startling fashion.

We are not in the same moral situation as in the last war. Then the Church on the whole went quite frankly nationalist. It was taken for granted that the function of Christianity in war time was to be the servant of national morale. And it is not surprising that we began to hear that ominous phrase, 'a moratorium for Christianity.' But in the intervening years we have pondered over that collapse, and we have begun to learn the lesson of it. What is being burnt in upon us is that the thing that is really at stake in this war is ultimate moral and religious principle, about which Christians cannot remain indifferent. We cannot contract out of our obligation. The one course that is ruled out for the Christian is merely to sit in the grandstand and look on.

Are we, then, involved in a moral contradiction such as demonstrates that Christianity is impracticable in this present evil world? Have we to choose between such 'detachment' as would turn Christianity into a kind of Buddhism, and such an accommodation to the world as would rob it of every claim to be religious? To accept either alternative would imply radical misunderstanding of the nature of Christianity itself.

The central fact is that Christianity is in its essential nature a revelation of God in human history. That means that both in creed and in conduct it presents a unique conception of the true relationship between what is absolute and what is relative. It is not a 'timeless' theory about God, but a gospel about God as revealed in Jesus under the conditions of life in Palestine in the principate of Augustus and Tiberius. The absolute is revealed in the relative. So far as belief is concerned this means that there is always and necessarily some measure of intellectual tension.

But we are concerned now with the Christian life. And the point here is that the Word has always to be made flesh, to be verified in the actual circumstances which confront us. The Christian lives in two worlds, from neither of which he can be denationalized. Man is a citizen of the eternal Kingdom, and the centre of gravity for human life is in fellowship with God and life eternal. Yet he is a product of history and a citizen of earthly cities. To both of these kingdoms we belong. The one is absolute and the other relative. And we cannot contract out of either. Moreover, it is within the citizenship of earth that Christians must fulfil the obligations of the citizenship which is in heaven.

This is the ethical problem of which conduct in war time is a special case. And it raises at once the question of compromise. Can Christians transform society without being subdued to its standards? There are some (as there always have been some) who are so alive to the challenge that they have recourse to the radical solution of seeking to withdraw from the world. The hermit did that. The

Pacifist does it to-day. He says about war, 'I refuse to have anything to do with it.' That is the working ideal of the monastic system. The Pacifist, however, cannot strip himself of being a citizen with all the involvement in the social order. He cannot contract out altogether. His ideal, which is impossible, is what Canon BARRY somewhat obscurely calls the Salt.

On the other hand, the ideal of the Leaven, which is that of the ordinary church member, is notoriously exposed to danger. We try to change the world from within, but too often the leaven has been drowned in the lump. It is fatally easy for Christians to accept the prevailing standards of their group till there is not much left that is distinctive between the Christian and his next-door neighbour who is professedly a 'man of the world.'

This is probably the real ground for the growing indifference of our own people to what is called organized religion. They complain that the churches have 'nothing to say to them.' And this means that the Church does not speak to their condition just because the traditional Christian ethic, as it is expressed in books and sermons, no longer fits the facts of the world to-day. Once it moves beyond the family and personal relationships into the world of citizenship and livelihood it seems to have lost touch with realities as they present themselves to the man in the street. Of course, the Christian teaching has influenced, and does influence, social life and industry in many ways. But it remains true that there is a clash between the established ethic of society and the law of love proclaimed in the New Testament.

This is the root of the ethical problem. And this is the point at which Canon BARRY uses the ambiguous word 'compromise.' Of course the demands of Christ are absolute, but there is a sense in which compromise is the very condition of the Christian life. In 'doing the will of God' we must act; and it is in this world, with all its limiting conditions, we must act. They define the limits of what is possible. We can do no more than what can be done, and that is seldom the 'ideal' course. It follows that there is no such thing as a 'pure' Christian action. There are Christians acting, more or less faithfully, on the raw material which life gives them, in the job that has to be done where they are. There are Christian principles and standards and ends, but these do not define Christian conduct for us.

'What I mean,' says Canon BARRY, 'is that the things Christians do will, as often as not, necessarily fall short of what would be done in a fully Christian order; and, if we are not prepared to face that, the only alternative is a Trappist monastery.' Of course, this is open to grave misunderstanding. We must never compromise with conscience. The choice of the second best is always sinful. But equally clearly there is no 'best' course independent of actual circumstances. If we shrink from relative decisions we cannot be doing the will of God at all. Moreover, no sinful man is capable of any 'absolutely' good action. If we think we can live in this world in absolute love, honesty, and purity we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

So we face the present situation. We are involved in a war which, if the Allies are defeated, will result in the eclipse of even the possibility of Christian life in the West for generations. It is within this actual situation that the Christian has to decide on his duty. He may decide on Pacifism. But, if he does, he must remember that he is free to do so only because other fellow-Christians stand in arms between him and the Gestapo. The latter service must not be regarded by him as a lower grade of Christian loyalty. It is what Christian duty requires, as conditions are now, from the great majority.

There are no rules in Christian living, no law. Christ revealed a new spirit in which we are to approach the moral decisions which life itself sets us. And normally, and nearly all the time, we must live with the relative and fragmentary. What is hard is not to lose sight of the eternal city, not to be dulled into acquiescence in the conventional sub-Christian standards. The disciple's acts are relative, but the Lord's claim is absolute. There are no *specified* Christian acts. But there is the

authentic fruit of the Spirit—those qualities of mind and character born in the hearts in which Christ is King. Through them the new life comes into the world and the Kingdom of God enters the plane of history.

The problem of pain presses very acutely upon men's minds at the present day, much more acutely than, say, the problem of sin. Many have come to feel that the amount of pain and suffering in the world makes faith in a God of love and power incredible.

Much has been written, especially from the Christian standpoint, if not to solve the problem, at least to alleviate and make it more tolerable. Of these apologetic writings a good deal is superficial and at times exasperating, while stock arguments tend to grow hackneyed.

It is therefore a rare pleasure when one meets a book which treats the subject with real freshness and distinction of thought. And this is what we have in *The Problem of Pain*, by Mr. C. S. Lewis, M.A. (Centenary Press; 3s. 6d. net). It is a comparatively short book but it treats its subject in a great way. The writer is engagingly frank in regard to his own feelings and experiences, and he has the gift of an interesting style. But, what is more important, he is a thinker who goes to the root of the matter and lifts the whole discussion on to a very high level indeed.

The book has two special excellences. It begins with God and not with man. 'Man is not the centre; God does not exist for the sake of man. Man does not exist for his own sake.' Then it gives full weight to the fact of sin, without which no treatment of the problem of pain can be anything else but superficial and out of focus. Let us indicate briefly what is involved in this manner of approach to the problem.

It is common to approach the problem from man's point of view. A picture is drawn, often in high colours, of the pain and suffering in the world, and then the question is discussed of whether it is possible in the face of all this to reach out to a faith in God. All can see the difficulty, many would affirm the impossibility. But here we meet with a counter-problem. 'If the universe is so bad, or even half so bad, how on earth did human beings ever come to attribute it to the activity of a wise and good Creator? Men are fools, perhaps; but hardly so foolish as that. The direct inference from black to white, from evil flower to virtuous root, from senseless work to a workman infinitely wise staggers belief. The spectacle of the universe as revealed by experience can never have been the ground of religion; it must always have been something in spite of which religion, acquired from a different source, was held.' This, when one thinks of it, is perfectly obvious, for every generation of men has bitterly felt the pain and waste of human life. To mention nothing else, 'reflect for five minutes on the fact that all the great religions were first preached, and long practised, in a world without chloroform.'

What then are the grounds of religion? If the inference from the course of events in the world to the goodness and wisdom of the Creator has never given rise to any religion, whence comes man's faith in God? 'In all developed religion we find three strands or elements, and in Christianity one more. The first of these is what Professor Otto calls the experience of the *Numinous*.' That is to say, the elemental feeling of something ghostly and uncanny behind Nature, something which awes and fascinates by its tremendous mystery. This feeling is not given in the facts of experience or derived by any argument. It is primary and innate.

The second strand or element in religion is the sense of moral obligation, of a Law approved as good yet continually disobeyed. Here is an inexplicable thing that 'all men stand condemned, not by alien codes of ethics, but by their own, and all men therefore are conscious of guilt.' The third strand is woven when men identify these two, that is, 'when the Numinous Power to which they feel awe is made the guardian of the morality to which they feel obligation.' This conclusion is not reached by observation or by logic, but is the expression

of some primary conviction of the human soul. 'For the actual behaviour of that universe which the Numinous haunts bears no resemblance to the behaviour which morality demands of us. The one seems wasteful, ruthless, and unjust; the other enjoins upon us the opposite qualities. Nor can the identification of the two be explained as a wish-fulfilment, for it fulfils no one's wishes. We desire nothing less than to see that Law, whose naked authority is already unsupportable, armed with the incalculable claims of the Numinous.'

Here then is man's innate sense of the power and goodness of God, which has a root in his soul independent of his variable experiences and which cannot be eradicated by them. The problem of pain is still there, but it must be discussed in the light of that conviction and not by ignoring it. In approaching the problem we must understand more clearly what is implied in the omnipotence and the goodness of God. In regard to the former the main point to be observed is that 'not even Omnipotence could create a society of free souls without at the same time creating a relatively independent and "inexorable" Nature.' No doubt we could conceive a world in which God corrected or prevented every abuse of free will—made guns, for instance, into butter when they tried to shoot. 'But such a world would be one in which wrong actions were impossible, and in which, therefore, freedom of the will would be void; nay, if the principle were carried to its logical conclusion, evil thoughts would be impossible, for the cerebral matter which we use in thinking would refuse its task when we attempted to frame them.'

As for the goodness of God, it is often most unworthily conceived as mere easy-going kindness. Many want, in fact, 'not so much a Father in Heaven as a grandfather in heaven, a senile benevolence who, as they say, "liked to see young people enjoying themselves," and whose plan for the universe was simply that it might be truly said at the end of each day, "a good time was had by all".' But it is only for people for whom we care nothing that we would wish happiness on any terms. With those whom we truly love we are more exacting and would sooner see them suffer much than be happy in degrading and estranging ways. Such is 'the Love that made the worlds, persistent as the artist's love for his work and despotic as a man's love for a dog, provident and venerable as a father's love for a child, jealous, inexorable, and exacting as love between husband and wife.'

The question then is what will result from the impact of this holy Love upon a world of sinful men? Full account must be taken of the fact of sin if the remedial and redemptive mission of pain is to be understood. 'A recovery of the old sense of sin is essential to Christianity. . . . When men attempt to be Christians without this preliminary consciousness of sin, the result is almost bound to be a certain resentment against God as to one who is always making impossible demands and always inexplicably angry. . . . When we merely *say* that we are bad, the "wrath" of God seems a barbarous doctrine; as soon as we *perceive* our badness, it appears inevitable, a mere corollary from God's goodness. . . . We actually are, at present, creatures whose character must be, in some respects, a horror to God, as it is, when we really see it, a horror to ourselves. This I believe to be a fact; and I notice that the holier a man is, the more fully he is aware of that fact.'

It is only from this standpoint that the problem of pain can be rightly approached and profitably discussed. On this Mr. Lewis has much to say that is wise, sympathetic, and profoundly true. 'God whispers to us in our pleasures, speaks in our conscience, but shouts in our pains. It is His megaphone to rouse a deaf world. A bad man, happy, is a man without the least inkling that his actions do not "answer," that they are not in accord with the laws of the universe.' 'All arguments in justification of suffering provoke bitter resentment against the author. You would like to know how I behave when I am experiencing pain, not writing books about it. You need not guess, for I will tell you—I am a great coward. But what is that to the purpose? When I think of pain . . . it "quite o'er crows my spirit." If I knew any way of escape I would crawl through sewers to find it. . . . I am not arguing that pain is not painful. Pain hurts. That is what the word

means. I am only trying to show that the old Christian doctrine of being made " perfect through suffering " is not incredible. To prove it palatable is beyond my design.'

Dr. S. C. CARPENTER, Dean of Exeter, has published a volume entitled *Faith in Time of War* (Eyre & Spottiswoode ; 6s. net). Its compilation was only a matter of weeks, and it is not surprising that it shows a certain looseness of structure ; but it contains much useful exposition and many topical allusions.

The first part of the book consists chiefly of an account of faith : among the Hebrews, in the Gospels, in the Apostolic age, and through the centuries. In the last instance the treatment is to take a few ' snapshots ' here and there in illustration of the range and power of faith. From the nineteenth century two patterns of faith are chosen, Frederick Denison Maurice and Mrs. Josephine Butler. Where there are so many to choose from, the choice inevitably appears arbitrary.

The second part of the book gives reasons for faith, considers the marks of faith in action, treats of faith as an antidote to fear, and ends with a chapter, of which we now proceed to give a summary, on ' The Vision of Faith.'

What hopes, it is asked, may be entertained by Christian people of being able to recognize and understand phenomena to-day, and to foresee truly the events of the future ? If we are to answer this question, there are said to be four points which it seems essential to keep in view.

The first is that Christian faith involves believing that the Body of Christ is in the world to-day, entrusted with, and actually performing, the work of Christ ; which is the work of gathering disciples, teaching, forgiving, feeding them, and equipping them for their Christian warfare in the world. But it should be remembered that the Church, like other institutions, has an immense amount of organization, furniture, and custom which is purely human. If the Church of England has no authority to produce another Bible, another Creed, another Ministry, and other Sacraments, all else—including the Book of Common Prayer—can be changed if necessary. And the present embodiment of the Church might be turned into something very much better.

The second thing which is seen by the vision of faith is that large masses of existing spiritual forces, at present unattached, uninstructed, uninspired, and unhelpful, will be mobilized. In particular, the experience of the war will make those who control education determined that the ruling aim shall be to develop the Christian character. And why should they not take hints from the less sinister side of experiments elsewhere ? They should launch out into the deep and let down their nets.

The third element in the vision is not clearly indicated in the chapter, but it is suggested by the vision that came to the ' prophet's servant ' of ' chariots and horses of fire, round about Elisha.' It should be an encouragement of faith—so we seem to be told—that the work of utilizing the splendid material awaiting the discipline of Christian education will not depend on the existing Church organization alone, or even upon the Christian forces manifestly operative in the community, but upon the presence of the living Christ Himself. With Francis Thompson we should see Christ walking on the water, ' not of Gennesareth, but Thames.'

The last element in the vision of faith is freedom, which comes from above, and which respects the differences in human nature. In present-day Germany we see the violation on a large scale of this sacred principle. The secret of freedom is none other than Christ, who is the Word made flesh, and whose is a universal quality which can reach every individual. If we know the Truth, the Truth shall make us free.

Spiritual Problems and the War.

III. Reflections on the Problem of Church and State.

By the Reverend Canon T. Guy Rogers, M.C., B.D., Rector of Birmingham.

There is a sentence in the opening chapter of Volume VI. of the Report of the Tambaram Missionary Conference which may well introduce these reflections: 'Relations between Church and State can only be static when the Church has ceased to grow and the form of the State has become fixed.' I do not know whether the writer meant to imply that such a situation could ever arise. I hardly think so, for in his masterly analysis of the problems of Church and State as they affect the mission field he presents us with a mass of evidence to the contrary. We may safely assume that so long as the Church lives it will go on growing, and so long as men go on thinking the form of the State, and what is perhaps more important, the functions of the State will go on changing. In other words, we may assume that there never will be any escape from the tension of Church and State. It will vary from acute conflict to well regulated co-operation. It will produce in the course of history—sometimes on the part of the Church tyrannical claims and a base subservience—sometimes on the part of the State violence and persecution. It will bring about all kinds of concordats and working arrangements according to the political theory dominant at the moment and the culture and tradition of the nation concerned. We need not commit ourselves to Marxian dialectic philosophy in accepting this law of tension governing the relations of human life. We can accept it as a law of God essential for man's growth in wisdom and discipline and right living. But there it is—tension, differing in extent and character in a hundred ways—governs and presumably always will govern the relations of Church and State.

For this reason the study of concrete facts and particular situations is of more interest at the moment to the student than the formulation of general principles. This latter has been very adequately done by the Oxford Conference on Church, Community, and State. We may recall the pertinent passage from the volume, *The Churches Survey their Task.*

> 'We recognize as essential conditions necessary to the Church's fulfilment of its primary duty that it should enjoy (*a*) freedom to determine its faith and creed; (*b*) freedom of public and private worship, preaching, and teaching; (*c*) freedom from any imposition by the State of religious ceremonies and forms of worship; (*d*) freedom to determine the nature of its government and the qualifications of its ministers and members, and, conversely, the freedom of the individual to join the church to which he feels called; (*e*) freedom to control the education of its ministers, to give religious instruction to its youth, and to provide for adequate development of their religious life; (*f*) freedom of Christian service and missionary activity, both home and foreign; (*g*) freedom to co-operate with other churches; (*h*) freedom to use such facilities, open to all citizens or associations, as will make possible the accomplishment of these ends, as, *e.g.* the ownership of property and the collection of funds.'

Here in this statement, which will command the general support of churchmen, the crucial word is freedom. It is evident that in practice different churches interpret the obligations of freedom in different ways and have different conceptions of how to relate their own freedom to the freedom of the State. It is unlikely that the Church of England will ever be as sensitive, theoretically or practically, as the Church of Scotland on this question of freedom. The history of the two Churches and the temperament of the two peoples is distinct. Where the State has long been governed and administered in close relation to the Christian tradition, and when people are as pragmatical in their way of living as the English, a great deal of influence, direct or indirect, will be conceded by the Church to the State. It is only 'in the last resort,' to quote the words of the English Episcopate after the rejection of the Prayer Book, that the Church will desire to enforce all its own inherent rights.

The Tambaram Report is particularly valuable in its concrete treatment of the subject. Both British and European churchmen, obsessed at times with the harassing nature of their own problems, need to be reminded that the freedom which the dominant Church demands for herself from the State is often refused by her to the Church of the racial minority or to some Evangelical Church in her midst. The freedom of the Church

is a double-edged weapon and must be allowed to cut both ways.

Here in this volume, which deserves to be more widely known, is set out the most amazing differences in the relations of Church and State throughout that vast area in which Christian Missions are at work. Take for example this summary of the relations of the Roman Catholic Church to the State in Latin America: 'In practice there has been establishment with privilege, establishment without privilege, and privilege with or without establishment.' But in no case will it be found that the Evangelical Church in these countries has secured any such freedom as it may possess through the goodwill of the dominant Church. It is to the secular State that the Evangelical Church must look for the vindication of essential Church rights in such circumstances. Perhaps this is the reason why so many good Christian people are slow to commit themselves to any rigid view with regard to the relation of Church and State. Too often in the past has the Church been a persecuting and intolerant force for people to be quite sure what its demand for 'freedom' means. Though not a trace remains of the demand for special privilege in the statement of the Oxford Conference, good people continue to be on their guard as much against a totalitarian Church as a totalitarian State.

It might be well if we approached this problem more often from the point of view of the State, remembering that whatever the religion, Christian or Muslim or Shinto, some kind of working relationship has to be established involving the adjustment of claims which may seem quite reasonably to be in conflict. Resistance to the State is more fully justified when the case for the State is more fully understood. The Tambaram Report provides just such a survey of experimental relationships as may acquaint the reader with most of the salient facts. He is left with a series of difficult reflections. Is it better that Turkey should secularize all life, creating a prejudice against religion in general, or that Egypt should preserve the privilege of the Muslim religion to the disadvantage of Christianity? Is the disestablishment even of the Muslim religion all gain? Is it better that the Christian Church should work in an atmosphere of tolerant materialism or in an atmosphere of severe religious persecution? How far is it right for the Christian Church to acquiesce in some of the methods and usages of our own Colonial administration? Here and there the general policy of toleration or strict neutrality towards the religious beliefs of the peoples of the Empire is broken by the necessity of maintaining order. In British Somaliland, now occupied by the Italians, no missionary was allowed to enter for fear of Islam. Some of my fundamentalist friends would probably regard the present occupation as a judgment of God on our own country. But Somaliland is not an isolated instance. The rulers of several Indian States do not admit Christian missions. In Northern Nigeria something closely resembling the 'establishment' of the Muslim religion is maintained. Until recently, at any rate, the promise given to the Emirs that there should be no 'interference' with their religion was interpreted to mean that none but pagan tribes could be evangelized.

These various restrictions might well be regarded as an infringement of one of 'the essential conditions necessary to the Church's fulfilment of its primary duty' as laid down by the Oxford Conference (compare (*f*) 'Freedom of Christian Service and missionary activity both home and foreign'). But few people would deny that genuine considerations of order (whether these instances are genuine need not be discussed here) would justify a government, in presence of intense fanaticism dangerous to life, in suspending for the time being at least the institutional work of Christian missions. The presupposition of the successful working of any kind of religion is the existence and preservation of some kind of order. The Christian virtues cannot be applied to the life of the jungle. (This fact may or may not have its bearing on the limitations of the possible practice of Pacifism at a time when the foundations of order are being destroyed.) It certainly has to be taken into account by governments faced with the question of the official introduction of missions into a highly fanatical Muslim country. To go cannily need not imply any betrayal of the Christian faith.

Curiously enough the most sympathetic and at the same time the most searching analysis of the dilemma in which the State may find itself, which I have seen, is to be found in Dr. Arthur Frey's powerfully written book, *Cross and Swastika*, which deals with the ordeal of the German Church. He quotes an illuminating passage from a lecture by Dr. Max Huber, a Swiss, formerly President of the International Court of Arbitration at the Hague. It is worth quoting at some length:

> 'The more the State realizes in its "nomos" the idea of community, the more it wants to be the bearer of the spiritual values residing in its people, the nearer lies the danger of its regarding itself as the historical embodiment of the divine will, and of claiming as its own proper sphere the

> sphere of the moral duties of man to man, yes, the danger of its authority stepping into the place of the divine authority. This danger is especially great when man has lost his mainstay in belief in the Gospel or when this belief, if not lost, has been shaken and weakened. Then it is natural for man to see in the State the substitute for the authority of God which has been lost to him, and for the lost fellowship which springs from the Gospel. The State can apparently meet this quest of man, of the intellectually homeless man, " fed up " with his unfettered freedom. And besides it is of the very essence of every political principle that it tends to realize itself in its utmost consequences in accord with a rational or a mystical logic ; it tends to go on developing not in accord with empirical necessities, as is done in a healthy political system, but in accord with ideological necessities. Not only the idea of freedom, even the ideas of authority and community, can become demonic things. The criticism and the corrective of this development is the Gospel, the Gospel in its totality.'

This lifts the discussion of the subject to the highest level. With little change the words might be addressed not only to his immediate hearers but to all those States which are trying experimental solutions of a secular kind. Again and again it is the perversion or exaggeration of what is in itself good which creates the impossible situation which finally results. Nationalism within limits has a contribution to make to the stability and communal sense of the people concerned. The State is not normally a figment of satanic imagination or a product of demonic forces. It need not be the vehicle of an evil spirit. It may represent the collective wisdom and experience of a whole people concerned not about a soulless machine but about the welfare of the individual people who compose it. It is entitled to its full share of rightful responsibility. With such a State the Church should and would endeavour to co-operate, not merely for the maintenance of order but for the promotion of culture. Given goodwill on the part of the State and a general community of aim, compromise on the part of the Church may be a Christian policy. But when the State becomes in the full modern sense totalitarian it is too late for such a policy. There is no alternative then to accepting the rôle of persecution and martyrdom.

Meantime the emphasis which Dr. Max Huber places on lost fellowship with God, the denial of divine authority, and the condition of intellectual homelessness, is a warning to all who seek a secular solution without realizing the full implications which ' godlessness ' brings with it, and which the provisional grant of freedom of conscience does nothing to correct. For Muslim States as well as nominally Christian States, resolving on some secular solution, the end of which is not foreseen, the warning is obvious.

For the Christian Church, however, there is much more in this passage by way of warning. It will be noticed that *The Gospel* is the counterpart or antidote or opposite number—or shall we say partner in the axis with the State ? The Gospel not the Church ! This is in accordance with the main argument of the book though it is not always so clearly expressed. It is not the Church, as the Church, which is offering resistance to totalitarian claims but the Confessional Church inspired by the Gospel. Nor is it for the freedom of the Church as the Oxford Conference would define its freedom that the Confessional Church is fighting, but for the freedom of ' the Word of God.' The only importance to be attached to the Church is its capacity for witnessing by word and life to ' the Word of God.' That particular part of the Church which stands by the Barmen Confession of faith in the Word of God is, in the eyes of the writer, the only Church that counts in the German conflict—and it only counts because of its more complete subordination to the authority of God's Word in the Gospel.

Here is a notable shifting of the front, in the age-long tension between Church and State, which will have to be taken account of in the days to come. The Confessional Church in Germany may rest upon too narrow a foundation. Its Barthian philosophy of religion may be quite inadequate. But its emphasis on the Gospel and its distrust of the official Church indicates the great complexities of this fascinating problem of Church and State. It is perhaps too readily assumed that all Christian sympathy must be with the Church in any quarrel which it may have with the State, and that the official voice of the Church represents the intrinsically Christian position. The Confessional Church has done the world a service in repudiating that view within the sphere of Church connexion to which it belongs. Its restatement of the problem, as one not of Church and State but of the Word of God and the State, is a salutary warning to the Church as a whole of the form which the problem may one day take.

We must not expect too much from the Church which, whatever its divine origin, is a very human institution. Its official leaders and spokesmen may often overstate its claims as happens so often in the case of the Roman Catholic Church, or understate them as happens in the case of certain forms

of Liberalism. We can start with no presupposition that the Church is right or the State is wrong before the facts of each particular crisis or challenge are examined. Perhaps the Pope is to be less blamed than some of us imagine for confining himself to the enunciation of great Christian principles in the present conflict. The Roman Catholic Church as an institution is too committed to national interests on either side—it has a footing in so many camps—the repercussions of its policy are so far reaching—that its Head is practically condemned to be a neutral. I understand from the book, *The Pope Speaks*, by Charles Rankin, which contains the record of the Pope's admirable pronouncements, that the Pope himself has no quarrel with the title assigned to him, 'the Great Neutral.' Cardinal Hinsley may speak concretely for some 'group' in England or, for all I know, some Italian cardinal may speak concretely in very different language in Italy, but the Pope as the Pope must speak less pointedly. It is better that it should be so than, for example, that the Abyssinian campaign should seem to be officially blessed. The true voice of the Roman Catholic Church, as in the case of the German Church, may be found eventually with some group that grounds itself more nearly on the Word of God.

But I fear these reflections, which for me are only begun, must now cease. If I have at all succeeded in showing how the enunciation of principles is much the smaller part of the problem, and how necessary it is to study the relations of Church and State from both ends, with sympathy for the people at either end, it is perhaps as much as I set out to do. Though it is only a half truth it is worth remembering, when hope deferred makes the heart sick, that with goodwill even a bad system may work well, and without goodwill a good system may work better than a bad one. Such are the imponderables of the human element in human life!

Literature.

NOUUM TESTAMENTUM GRAECE.

It was convenient in more ways than one that the first part of the 'New Tischendorf' to be published was the 'Gospel According to St. Mark' (April, 1935). With commendable rapidity it has now been followed by St. Matthew—*Nouum Testamentum Graece Secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum: Euangelium Secundum Matthaeum cum apparatu critico novo plenissimo, lectionibus codicum nuper repertorum additis, editionibus versionum antiquarum et patrum ecclesiasticorum denuo investigatis*, edidit S. C. E. Legg, A.M. (Milford; 25s. net). In this case the materials are much more abundant. Mr. Legg's task has been stupendous, and he is to be heartily congratulated on its completion. The Clarendon Press has also thereby added another to the more wonderful of its typographical achievements.

A worthy review of such a work demands about ten years' use and a detailed comparison with the 8th edition of Tischendorf. The latter task would show what signal progress has been made during the last seventy years, and even a brief examination shows what a valuable instrument has now been put in the hands of scholars and students. In the three departments of manuscripts, versions, and patristic citations a great advance is evident. Among the most welcome additions to the critical apparatus are the readings of W (the Washington Codex), Θ (the Koridethi MS.), fragments of six papyri, more exact particulars of various minuscules, readings of the Sahidic and Bohairic versions, and perhaps, most welcome of all, the Georgian.

When a man makes thousands of statements in print, absolutely faultless accuracy is almost impossible to attain. I have seen hardly any errors of commission, though I venture to think I have noticed a very few of omission. Burkitt and Lowe both assign Codex Bezae to the fifth century, not the sixth; the symbol f has slipped out before Brixianus. The date assigned to Horner's Coptic applies only to the Sahidic. 'Eucharius' should be 'Eucherius,' Eugippius is wrongly dated saec iv.-v. instead of saec vi. Or it is dated saec iv.-v., but saec vi. is more likely and saec vii. has even been suggested. 'Rureius' should be 'Ruricius.' Mr. Legg is hardly to blame for 'Petavionensis' as the editor of Victorinus' text was himself ignorant of the true form 'Poetoviensis.'

So much for the prefatory matter. Now for a very few notes on the body of the book. At 5^{4} the evidence of the Latin Vulgate is the opposite of what is stated: 5^{32} the clause καὶ ὃς ἐὰν . . . μοιχᾶται

was omitted also from Greek and Latin MSS. known to Augustine (*adult. coniug.* 11): 6^{13} the clause 'which we cannot bear' after πειρασμόν, though known to Hilary, Ambrose, and Jerome, is not mentioned; 11^{27} there is patristic evidence for the inversion of the clauses; 12^{24}, for the spelling *Beelzebul* add Hilary on the Psalms, p. 29, 12–16: 20^{23} Hilary and Augustine use the reading ἄλλοις: 22^{3} Jerome attests τὸν δοῦλον for τοὺς δούλους: 23^{38} is not, apparently, cited by 'Cyp.': $27^{16.17}$ Orig. is not mentioned here as evidence for 'Jesus Barabbas': 28^{19} for omission of πάντα add Aug. *C.D.*, 13. 24.

Jerome composed his commentary on Matthew on Palestinian soil. May a future editor of his work express his personal gratitude for the signally valuable aid in his task with which Mr. Legg has furnished him? A. SOUTER.

CONSCIENCE AND LIBERTY.

This short book, *Conscience and Liberty*, by Mr. Robert S. W. Pollard (Allen & Unwin; cloth 4s. 6d. net, paper 2s. 6d. net), is disappointing, as its treatment of a great subject is inadequate even within its limits of space, and not impartial, as such a treatment should be. It contains much interesting and valuable material in parts, but the argument as a whole is unconvincing. The first chapter, on 'What is Conscience?', fails to give a satisfying answer. It states crudely and dismisses curtly the religious answer, in my judgment the only true answer. If there be a God, and He be what Christian monotheism affirms, no definition of conscience which ignores man's relation to Him, and the dependent and derivative nature of conscience can afford a solid basis for its authority. As the writer adopts the utilitarian standard of morality 'that every individual is of equal value, and has an equal right to happiness' (p. 105) conscience resolves itself into a calculation of expediency, a reasoning on the known facts as to what will permit, or what will hinder such happiness, and more than once he claims for political opinion the same authority, and the same claim for liberty in speech and deed. He has no conception of reason in the Kantian sense as a source of values, and his treatment is entirely empirical. He still stands for the extreme *individualism* of last century which is now quite an anachronism, except as regards the economic sphere, for he asserts 'that liberty and democracy will never be secure until there is economic equality' (p. 114)—to secure that would involve an invasion of individual liberty more oppressive than any which he condemns. Judging from his own treatment of his subject as well as the literature which he cites he clearly belongs to the Left, always 'agin the Government.' His conception of the State is quite inadequate. There is a shocking statement of Leonard Woolf's quoted on p. 106: 'It has no more connexion with our best selves than has a sewage farm, and it is reasonable to expect just as little and just as much sweetness and light in the State as in a water-closet.' The State is an abstraction unless we regard it as a necessary and legitimate organ, not of external order only, but of community, or fraternity, the third of the triad in the motto of the French Revolution without which the other two—liberty and equality—cannot be realized. The author is always insisting on rights; he scarcely ever mentions duties; and so the liberty for which he argues would resolve itself into anarchy. There is an anti-church bias in the survey he gives in his third chapter of persecution; he compares the Church at its worst in this respect with Islam at its best, ignoring what at other times both have been, and he does not do full justice to the contribution of English Nonconformity to the promotion of liberty. His censure of the restrictions on liberty in war time (1914–1918) and now (1939–1940) and in the interval does not adequately recognize the dangers to be averted and the needs to be met in such a situation, and the responsibility of Government to avert disaster and distress. Of Scottish Dissenting ancestry and now at home and active in English Nonconformity, a Liberal in politics since Gladstone in 1879 kindled my political ardour, I care as much as does the author for the conservation of liberty and with some of his censures of bureaucracy I can agree, but it is not by such inconsiderate advocacy that the cause will be promoted, and therefore I am disappointed.

A. E. GARVIE.

THE DECLINE OF RELIGION.

Dr. Cecil P. Martin is Professor of Anatomy in McGill University, Montreal, but he is an earnest student of the Bible and a convinced Christian. He has written a book on *The Decline of Religion* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net) and he offers in excuse for venturing into this field 'the fact that many of my scientific colleagues avail themselves of every opportunity for expressing their opinions which are frequently very anti-religious.' No excuse, however, is needed for the writer is fully competent and his book is a contribution of value.

Perhaps the most interesting part is that in which he deals with science. He has no patience with the absurd adulation of 'the scientist' so common to-day among the ignorant. 'The scientist is frequently depicted as a noble figure who unselfishly dedicates his life to a patient pursuit of truth and bends all his energies to the noble task of acquiring exact and reliable information. He is wholly free from personal and selfish motives, and far above the meanness and pettiness that soil the common run of men. His attitude is often compared, very much to his favour, with that of his opponents who are supposed to be more partisan and liable to be swayed by ulterior motives. All this adulation is quite unjustified and in truth is very distasteful to many scientists. . . . Scientists are very ordinary members of *Homo sapiens*, quite liable to envy and jealousy, often very fond of vainglory, sometimes tempted by the lure of personal gain or fame, eager to acquire labels that purport to be recognitions of merit, and just as capable as any body of men of obstinately adhering to an irrational opinion.' That was much needing to be said and comes well from a Professor of science. His general conclusion is that 'the present widespread antipathy or even hostility to Christianity is founded on a number of misconceptions and misrepresentations.' These are our preoccupation with material things, our blindness to the limitations of science and the existence of spiritual realities of which science can take no account. There is also the further mistake of judging Christianity not by the character and teaching of Christ but by its modern materialized form. 'Dislike of these modern forms of Christianity combined with our scientific conceit which makes us contemptuous towards the judgments of our ancestors of pre-scientific days led to the conclusion that the whole Bible is a mass of myth and conjecture. So we dismiss the Bible and Christianity off-hand.' This is a vigorous and powerful book. J. H. Morrison.

ANCIENT AND ENGLISH VERSIONS.

An excellent, one is inclined to say an indispensable, book on the history of the Bible has just appeared—*The Bible in its Ancient and English Versions* (Milford; 12s. 6d. net). It is an entrancing subject in which, as every minister who has lectured to a Bible class on 'How we got our Bible' knows, the Christian lay-mind is deeply interested. This scholarly but plainly written book is of composite authorship. The editor is Principal H. Wheeler Robinson who himself contributes an Introduction, the closing chapter on the 'Bible as the Word of God' and the account of the Hebrew Bible; Professor W. H. Howard deals with the Greek Bible; Professor T. H. Robinson with the Syriac Bible; the Rev. H. F. D. Sparks with the Latin Bible; Sir W. A. Craigie, D.Litt., with English Versions to Wycliffe; Mr. J. Isaacs, M.A., with Sixteenth-century English Versions and with the Authorized Version and after; and Professor C. J. Cadoux with the Revised Version and after. Appended are a Bibliography, a Chronological Table, and Indexes of personal names, subjects, and Scripture references. The volume aims to meet the needs of theological students and of the intelligent layman, and is admirably suited for the purpose. The information given as to ancient Versions is interesting and, especially for New Testament students, important. So much has to be learned about the vast number of manuscripts that too little attention is usually paid to the Versions which are not only interesting as versions but for the light they cast on Text and Canon.

As to the English Versions much information is conveyed that to most readers will be new. Throughout care has been taken to be full and accurate and yet to avoid overloading with detail. The merits and defects of the English Revised Version are indicated, and the editor has wise remarks about the need for and the difficulty of procuring a new revision. It is clear that no translation can ever be final. W. D. Niven.

THE BIBLE AND WAR.

In his contribution to the Christian-News Letter series: *War—What Does the Bible Say?* (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. net), Dr. J. R. Coates discusses—in impressionist rather than argumentative style—the teaching of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament, on the subject of war. The old-fashioned directness of his title introduces a thoroughly modern attitude. He has little sympathy with those who look upon the prophetic books, particularly in their military references, as a string of predictions which can be authenticated only by exactly-dated fulfilments. He wishes to rescue these books from the hands of 'oracle-mongers,' and to replace them in their true setting as part of the sacred history of the development and 'coming-of-age' of the people of God. With the proviso of this purpose, he traces the changing phases of the idea of war—from the level at which war was taken for granted and God was conceived of as pre-eminently the Lord of war, through the

gradual heightening of thought when war became a duty rather than a passion and was regarded as an undesirable interruption in the life of a people organized for peace. Then, little by little, war became a problem, because it did not seem to fulfil its promise of removing the difficulties or overcoming the evils besetting the nation. Relief from the problem was found by recognizing war as the judgment of God, the Divine reaction to human failure and sin, carried to an extremity of severity in the annihilation or deportation of the people. Yet even in His wrath God does not permit the forces of Judgment to pass from out His control, for the world-conquerors whom He uses as rods of punishment come also to destruction. So, out of the terrors of war—dramatically brought to a concentrated climax in the *Revelation* vision of Armageddon—a new spirit emerges, expressible in the new covenant and the conception of an individual relation of man to God. There is now a war against war, and the weapons have the spiritualized form of the struggle for social righteousness, political disaster leading to a completeness of trust in God as the founder of a Kingdom which cannot be destroyed by any earthly conflicts—the Old Testament preparing the way for the New.

This book is pacifist in tone, not in its references to the occurrences of the past or the actualities of the present, but in its anticipations of the future and its appeal for the enrichment of that spirit which will make us ready for the post-war years. Its fundamental principle is given in a quotation from Matthew Henry, 'Times of war should be times of reformation.' W. S. URQUHART.

COMMENTARY ON ST. MATTHEW.

A new commentary on the Gospel of Matthew for schools, with a side glance at parents and even teachers, has been written by the Rev. Paul P. Levertoff, D.D.—*St. Matthew, with Introduction, Maps, and Explanatory Notes* (Murby; 3s. 9d. net). This is Dr. Levertoff's third contribution to the same subject. Years ago he was asked by a German Academic Institution to edit the Hebrew text of St. Matthew, with a commentary in Hebrew. Later he wrote on the subject in Bishop Gore's 'New Commentary.' He may justly claim, therefore, to be a recognized authority on the gospel. And the present volume fully justifies such a claim. It may be briefly described. There is a fairly long introduction on (*a*) the Synoptic problem; (*b*) the date and authorship of Matthew; (*c*) the background of the gospel, including essays on the Roman Empire at this period, the religious groups in Palestine, the physical features of the land and a long and most interesting account of the Synagogue and the school; (*d*) a section on the particular character and aim of the gospel; and finally (*e*) a scheme of the Contents which shows that, in the author's opinion, St. Matthew had a clear plan in his mind.

Each section of the gospel is preceded by a brief introduction, and (very happily) the notes (few and illuminating) are printed on the same page as the text. There are two plans, of Jerusalem and the Temple, and one map. We have read the introduction with interest and profit, and sampled the notes which are all to the point, and we can commend this new guide cordially to those scholars and their teachers for whom it is intended. It should be added that Dr. Levertoff has an original theory as to how the Evangelist arranged his material. Echoes of the Synagogue Lectionary are to be found in the gospel, and the author believes that St. Matthew had these in view and disposed his material to fit in with the appropriate sections of Scripture then being read in the Synagogue.

F. J. RAE.

ST. PAUL AND HIS GOSPEL.

Canon A. E. Baker whose exposition of 'The Teaching of Jesus for Daily Life' was, deservedly, so favourably received, has put us further in his debt by giving us *St. Paul and His Gospel* (Eyre & Spottiswoode; 5s. net). While it is neither documented nor provided with a bibliography, it reveals acquaintance with the most recent and important contribution to the literature on St. Paul. It exhibits no less an independent mind that with keen insight and reverence has made its own deep probings into the thought of the great and so often elusive Apostle. The value of Canon Baker's concise book is twofold. On the positive side it unfolds the essential points of Pauline teaching on such great themes as Christ, the Church and its Worship, Faith and the Sacrament, the Holy Spirit, the Life of the Christian, and what the Apostle means by 'my Gospel.' On the negative side it deals trenchantly and effectively with 'some criticisms' of St. Paul. Not only is this the subject of the closing chapter, but it runs through the book. The 'criticism' in view is set forth in a 'composite' picture of Paul as one who knew little of and cared less for the historic Jesus, but formed his view which came to dominate the Church mainly out of primitive superstition, Rabbinism, and, the Mystery Religions.

Historic Christianity in short was the invention of Paul. Against this Canon Baker maintains convincingly that the connexion between Paul and Jesus is most intimate. The very essence of the gospel that Paul preached, his Good News, was forgiveness of sin—free forgiveness, and he got that thought from Jesus.

If here and there one must slightly disagree with Canon Baker, for example, with his too dogmatic statement 'it is clear that Paul the Christian was not a real man' (because as Ramsay has shown, the Apostle must have had available considerable means to appeal to Cæsar and hire a house for two years in Rome), or with what is said about Paul's 'simple, clear, and consistent' attitude to the Law. Regarding the Apostle's personality and thought the last word is unattainable, but Canon Baker's words are valuable indeed. W. D. Niven.

An excellent book on *The World's Need of Christ* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $2.00) has been written by Dr. Charles A. Ellwood. The writer is Professor of Sociology in Duke University, and naturally the social application of the gospel is his chief concern. But he very rightly insists that the tree of human nature must first be made good before it can bring forth the good fruit of a Christian social order. His book is to a great degree negative and critical, dealing mainly with 'the neglect of Christ in Science and Philosophy, in Religion and the Church, in Business and Industry, in Politics and International Relations.' In his final chapter on the Christian reconstruction of our civilization he becomes more positive and argues that 'the concrete programme of the Church for the Christian reconstruction of our civilization should consist of three main parts. First of all, the Church must combat the increasingly sensate character of our civilization. . . . In the second place the Church must teach the need and absolute obligation of universal love. . . . In the third place the Church must arouse and organize enthusiasm for the Christian cause among its members, especially for the building of Christ's Kingdom in this world.' With all this there will be general agreement, but it is in maintaining that spirit and bringing it to bear on particular problems that the whole crux of the matter lies.

The Runner's Bible, by Nora Holm (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net), is a little book which has had a certain vogue in America for some years and is now issued in Britain. Each chapter consists of a catena of Scripture texts with occasional brief comments. The various topics are grouped under three main headings—Statements of Truth, Divine Commands, and Promises. The whole is intended for spiritual direction and comfort. The writer goes somewhat to extremes in declaring that disease is unreal and arises from failure to discern the truth, but taking the little book as a whole it is full of stimulating Bible teaching.

Under the title *Go Up Higher* (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. William C. MacDonald, M.A., the popular Edinburgh minister, has set out to write 'a religious book, not too heavy, to send to a young soldier.' It is in three parts, the New Testament Portrait, the Declarations of Jesus, and Questions Jesus Asks, and under each heading there are five addresses. It is all plain straightforward gospel preaching. It makes no attempt to solve the riddle of the universe or deal with those intellectual difficulties which beset the academic rather than the popular mind. It should appeal to the common soldier who is after all just the man in the street in uniform. It is well fitted to guide him to an intelligent faith in Christ.

The pamphlet, *Cross into Swastika?* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3d.), is one of a series which deals with 'The Spiritual Aspects of the War.' The title *Cross into Swastika?* suggests the questions, Can the Cross be bent into the swastika as the picture on the cover seems to suggest, or in plain words, Is National Socialism a possible development of Christianity? That question the contents of the pamphlet, a comprehensive selection of characteristic statements in speech or writing by Nazi leaders, enables us to answer with an unhesitating and emphatic No. When its disguises are stripped from it, it appears 'naked and unashamed' as anti-Christ, a total departure from and a violent opposition to all that the Christian Church stands for in religious conviction or moral conscience. Such a collection will be very useful to speakers or writers dealing with the present conflict in Germany, and it provides convincing evidence of the justification of our country's conflict with Germany. The arrangement might have been more *genetic* or *organic*, showing the development of this ideology, and the relation of the parts of doctrine and practice to the whole. The persecution of the churches and the oppression of the nations are an inevitable result of the ideology.

Dr. Winnington-Ingram, after nearly forty years as Bishop of London, retains his vigour of mind and speech in a remarkable degree. He has issued four sermons under the title of *A Second Day of God* (Longmans; 1s. net). They are inspired by strong convictions vigorously expressed. 'To my mind, it is the greatest day which Great Britain has had for a thousand years, by herself to be guarding the gate of the House of Liberty, and the grand thing for us civilians is that we are all in the battle line together.' These four sermons, on the spiritual aspect of the War, Courage, Love to Enemies, and Eternal Life, are most helpful and invigorating.

Do We Really Die?, by the Rev. W. H. Elliott (Longmans; 6d. net), is a reprint of the last chapter of the writer's book, 'The Christian in His Blindness,' which appeared some years ago. His line of thought is that extinction at death is contrary to reason and to our faith in the love of God confirmed as it is by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Written with reverence and restraint this little book should bring real comfort and cheer to the sorrowing.

There is one question which every thoughtful and earnest mind is asking, and whoever can answer it ought to make a wide appeal. Mr. G. Thomson sets out to do so in his little book, *Do You Seek Reality?* (Lutterworth Press; 2s. net). It is the second of a new series which bears the title 'The Quest Library.' The chapters deal with Reality and Ourselves, Who is the Realist?, Who is the Idealist?, and Christianity and Modern Life (which occupies about half the book). The answer to the question in the title is, the author urges, to be found in Christ, and the discussion which leads to this conclusion is full of interest and enlightenment. It is a book easily read, though it handles profound matters, and the task is made easier still by the frequent quotations from contemporary works. This is a useful and able example of popular apologetic.

The Bride of Christ (Religious Book Club; 2s. 6d. to members), by the Rev. Claude Chavasse of the Altar Rectory, Toormore, County Cork, is subentitled as 'An Enquiry into the Nuptial Element in Early Christianity.' Or, as it is more simply put in the Preface, it is an enquiry into what the Book of Common Prayer calls 'The Mystical Union that is betwixt Christ and his Church.' We think it is not generally realized by students of Christianity what a large place the 'nuptial element' holds not merely in Pauline doctrine but in the Old Testament and in the literature of the early Christian centuries; and we are greatly indebted to Mr. Chavasse for his learned and comprehensive exposition of an idea whose origins the mysticism of the Middle Ages had strangely obscured. In particular, we are indebted to him for his account of the teaching on this subject given by St. Augustine, 'who, more than any other Christian teacher, has seen and expressed the manifold splendours of the Marriage of Christ and the Church.'

It is probable that the problem that presses most heavily in war time on minds devout or merely bewildered is that of prayer. Is it any use? Will it help to bring peace? Should we pray for victory? Can we, with any sincerity or hope of an answer, pray for our enemies? These, and others, are the questions discussed in a helpful little book by Canon F. A. Cockin and Mr. H. V. Ireson—*What Should Christians Pray For?: Wartime Discussions with an Ex-Serviceman* (S.C.M.; 1s. net). It is not an essay by one man, but a series of talks between the two mentioned above. These talks were broadcast, and the Canon, in his Preface, has a good deal to say about the numerous letters that reached him from people who listened to the broadcast. These ranged from hearers who were far more assured and definite than the Canon himself, to those whom a bitter experience of life had alienated from the faith. This will serve to point the value of the book. It is frank, modest, and sincere. And it supplies just the kind of guidance and assurance that so many need. Its chapters might with advantage form the basis of a series of sermons. Preaching of this kind is much needed.

The Historic Church and Present Need.

IV. The Universal Church and its Local Manifestation.

By Professor John Foster, M.A., Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

One of the most difficult sections of the Madras Conference was that which had to deal with the relation of Christianity to other faiths. The discussion there begun is admirably continued—by eight scholars of eight different nationalities!—in *The Authority of the Faith*.[1] I can best introduce you to the problem by smuggling you in to listen to the actual discussions at Madras. We shall choose a moment when representatives of each extreme are speaking.

The first is an Indian: 'Jesus Christ comes not to destroy but to fulfil. Even so He comes to India, not to pull down the old spiritual home. Rather His demand is the making of a new window where before there was a blank wall, or the replacing of smoky oil lamps by electric light.' I do not know how that strikes you. I am wondering, with a shudder, if he is going on to say 'h. and c. in every room.' The building analogy is an unfortunate choice. New Testament passages leap to one's mind about the One Foundation—not a new window—and the Chief Corner-Stone—not mere electric wiring. And so we ask ourselves, Is this enough?

Next a German: 'There is no such thing as what we used to call the Comparative Study of Religions. You cannot compare because there is no common standard. Christ is not fulfilment of but judgment upon our religious past. Even the Hebrew of the Hebrews, heir to the fullest apprehension of God yet to be found among men, had to say, "What things were gain to me, these have I counted loss for Christ."' Again I am uneasy, this time because of the *unrelatedness* of pre-Christian and Christian experiences. St. Paul spoke other words: 'He left not Himself without witness. . . . As certain even of your own poets have said. . . . What therefore ye worship in ignorance, this set I forth unto you.' Is not this an overstatement?

National sentiment, especially where it is of recent growth, makes some unduly sensitive of seeming criticism upon their cultural heritage. Others speak as though the whole of Christian truth can be summed up in terms of one rediscovered theological emphasis. The Conference had to declare, 'Christians are not agreed. This is a matter urgently demanding thought and united study.'[2] Perhaps the mistake is to imagine that by further thought and study we should arrive at an 'either . . . or' solution. The glory of our Lord is that with Him may be found room for 'both . . . and . . .' He is fulfilment, not in the sense of adding a bit more to that which was almost complete without Him, but as 'faith is the *hypostasis* of things hoped for,'[3] as a real presence may fulfil the dim perceptions of a dream. He is judgment upon our past, even our religious past at its best, since He not only satisfies the desires of every living thing, but awakens new, undreamed-of desires for things higher, deeper, eternal.

The practical part of the problem is how to relate Christianity to the background of pre-Christian thought so that it will remain Christianity, but cease to be a foreign faith. This is, of course, a great historic problem, one which belongs to the second century of the Church's life. Let us remind ourselves once again that in the lands of the Younger Churches it is the second century which is upon us now.

In the earliest extant letter of St. Paul there occurs a sentence which may be taken as 'convenient summary of the earliest Pauline teaching . . . the most effective means of reaching the consciences and satisfying the religious instincts of their heathen auditors.'[4]

> 'Ye turned to God from idols, to serve a living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivers us from the wrath to come.'[5]

If it is a summary of missionary preaching, it is also a summary of the great articles of belief among those who had been won over from paganism:[6]

[1] Tambaram Madras Series, i.

[2] *The Authority of the Faith*, 211. [3] He 11^{1}.

[4] G. Milligan, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians*, p. xlii f.

[5] 1 Th $1^{9.10}$.

[6] F. C. Burkitt, *Church and Gnosis*, 10 ff., to which I am largely indebted in working out this view of Gnosticism.

(1) Monotheism, (2) Second Advent, (3) Resurrection, (4) A Saviour from Judgment. Notice that such a statement of the faith bears two marks: It is essentially primitive and essentially Jewish. I say primitive, because it belongs to the days when the striking turn-over has been made—from idols to God, from the many to the One, from the dead to the Living, from the false to the True. Ask to-day any first generation Christian in China what it means to be a Christian and he will answer unhesitatingly, '*Pu pai p'u-sa*' ('We don't worship idols').[1] That may seem to you a disappointingly negative description. But mistake him not: The reason is the same—this tremendous choice is the experience which overshadows all else. The second mark (items 2, 3, 4, above) is the imprint of the missionary. Here in *Thessalonians* the statement of the faith for Greek Christians is essentially Jewish. 'We preach not ourselves,' says the Apostle to the Gentiles. But we can preach the truth only as we see it; we can see it only from our own standpoint, and describe it only in our own terms. Even so the faith of the first generation Christian to-day, apart from this primary and overwhelming experience of choice, is in terms learned from the missionary, translated from a foreign environment. Ask that Chinese Christian to go on and tell you more, and from his answer you may guess to which European or American mission he belongs.

St. Paul was the hero of the Church's first crisis, the conflict with the Judaizers. Christianity was not to be a sect within the national religion, but the faith which would claim mankind. He thus became the pioneer of all pioneer missionaries. There is one question however which, while it ought to belong to the mind of the pioneer—and it was in the mind of St. Paul—can never be his battle. The pioneer rediscovers, or demonstrates anew, the universality of the faith, but he is doomed to preach it in terms of foreign thought. Only later can it become indigenous. Care over that becoming he must leave to his successors. In the findings of the Madras Conference, it is stated:

> 'We strongly affirm that the Gospel should be expressed in indigenous forms, and that in methods of worship, institutions, architecture, etc., the spiritual heritage of the nation . . . should be taken into use. . . . The endeavour to give Christ His rightful place in the heart of a people who have not known Him—so that He will neither be a foreigner, nor will be distorted by pre-Christian patterns of thought—is a great and exacting spiritual task in the fulfilling of which a young church can bring a rich contribution of her own to the Church Universal.'[2]

This 'great and exacting spiritual task' belongs to the age after the great pioneers, the post-apostolic age, the second century of the missionary movement—*us*.

By the second century there are many reasons why expression of the faith must change. 'Ye turned. . . .' No, they did not—they were born of Christian parents. To that one overshadowing experience of choice they are strangers. Strangers too to those alien apostles. The Jewish missionaries are long since gone. Jerusalem itself as the mother-church is gone. The great figures of Christian history at the turn of the century—Ignatius, Clement, Polycarp, Justin, Aristides—are not Jews. The day of indigenous leadership has come. Neither the simplicity nor the borrowed nature of the primitive statement can satisfy. They must have a faith which is related to the culture around them.

So comes the second great crisis. The first was bound up with the origin of the missionary movement. The second is the problem of Christianity's indigenous expression.[3] 'Leave us free to make our own heresies,' said a young Ceylonese minister at Madras. I do not know how seriously he meant it. Heresy-hunting has fallen into disfavour in this age of broad toleration. We must ever beware lest our progress in broad-mindedness should reach the infinite breadth of vacuity. Still there is something to be said for this attitude in the churches of the West. If this is not a heresy-hunting, neither is it a heresy-making age. But heresy is an ever-present danger to the Younger Churches. *It ought to be.* They are precisely at that period of development.

That which was wrong with Gnosticism, in seeking to attain this desirable end of indigenous expression, was that it led not to a reinterpretation but to a ruin. The work of the Gnostics was not to bring essential Christianity to clear and vigorous expression through the use of indigenous symbols. It was to recast Christianity in the mould of indigenous philosophy. What came out was shaped by the mould. That which had been decisive was a pre-Christian apprehension of life. Something of Christianity was left adhering to the surface—that was all.

[1] See my *Chinese Church in Action*, 57.

[2] *The World Mission of the Church*, 53; *The Authority of the Faith*, 213 f.

[3] See H. Kraemer, *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World*, especially pp. 307–335; G. E. Phillips, *The Gospel in the World*, ch. xiv.

The thought-environment of Indian Christians is syncretism, of Chinese Christians humanism, of Japanese Christians nationalism; African Christians are obsessed by problems arising from a polygamous society. Thus each is tempted to forsake one part of the Christian tradition: the Indian, Christian history; the Chinese, Christian theology, the Japanese, Christian universality; the African, Christian morality. These are not meant to be sweeping generalizations but rather typical examples. Indian thinkers are tempted to let go of history, to identify Christian experience with Hindu mystical communion with the Soul-of-the-world, to apologize for any special mention of Jesus of Nazareth.[1] Chinese thinkers are tempted to let go theology: It does not matter what you believe about our Lord's relation to the Godhead if you accept Him as Ideal Man, One with a higher ethic than the *Chun Tzu* (Princely Man) of Confucius.[2] Japanese Christians in September 1939 resolved to 'co-operate in the realization' of the New Order in East Asia, and to 'stress the harmony between Christianity and the national objectives.'[3] A year later the Salvation Army had been forced to reorganize on a national basis, the Anglican Communion had asked its British and American bishops to resign, and six other great denominations had, under pressure of similar sentiments, come together in one National Church.[4] Much unrest in African churches is due to what is sometimes regarded as the finnickiness of missionary-imported traditions with regard to sex. It is all the modern equivalent of ancient Gnosticism. It is our second-century crisis, demanding our continued brotherly help and sympathy and prayer. Yes, *elder*-brotherly, for it is upon us that they depend for that experience which is history. A sense of history is the outstanding need of the Younger Churches. As the Madras findings say,[5] one of the chief tasks of the modern missionary is 'to embody and transmit the experience of the Universal Church.' That is no small order. It demands our utmost respect, both for the task itself, and for the men who go to it.

I always find it easier to think of the relation of Christianity to the non-Christian religions, when the terms of reference point me, not to a disembodied Christianity, but to the Christian Church. It is here that one can see plainly that the 'both . . . and . . .' solution must be the right one. The seed has life in itself, the same life generation after generation and whatever the field. But the seed is planted in the local soil. It is through that soil that its nourishment must come, and it must grow. Or, to change the parable, Christianity is represented by two lines, one downward the other across. The downward one is the continuity of Christian experience, the unchangeable 'faith once for all delivered to the saints,' the 'one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church.' The line across is that which reaches out to the environment, relates it to the here and now, our faith and our Church. Is it fanciful to think that it takes both these lines to form the symbol of our faith, the Cross? Let us look at each in turn.

First, the local manifestation: I have lived in China, wandered in the Philippines and Japan, and now most recently have visited India. In all these lands, I fear, we have transplanted the traditional architecture of our own worst period, we have scattered Asia with mock-Gothic and other Victorian ugliness. And in most we have acted as though the nurture of Christ's flock were inseparable from the bleating of American organs—instead of using the simple instruments of the place and consecrating their own music from the start.

But do not put down all such mistakes to the stupidity of the missionary. Often one is faced with the opposition of the people themselves. While any of the 'turned-to-God-from-idols' attitude remains that which is foreign will be welcomed because it is foreign. I recall a new church in one Chinese city. The (missionary) architect was keen on Chinese styles. He had given us a splendid pagoda instead of a steeple—a pagoda surmounted by a great cross. The building committee, composed of responsible Chinese business men, was considering the furnishings. I ventured to write urging that they should get a Chinese bell. Any one who has heard the boom echo and re-echo over the hills, as a monk in the neighbouring monastery has struck regular beats with his wooden ram, will agree that in China are cast some of the

[1] See *Rethinking Christianity in India* for a weakening of the position of the historic Christ (*e.g.* p. 75 f.); distaste for our historic connexion with the Old Testament; disowning of the historic Church. Much of it might have come from the pen of Marcion.

[2] Professor T. C. Chao in an article, 'The Future of the Church,' says that the 'naturalism and humanism' of his environment, with the 'shallowness' of his own religious experience, 'can at best lead the Chinese Christian to an adoption of the ethical teachings of Jesus. . . . Confucianist under a different name.'

[3] *National Christian Council of Japan Bulletin.*

[4] *New York Sun*, October 20, 1940; *Japan Christian Quarterly*, xv. 315–326.

[5] *The Life of the Church*, Tambaram Madras Series, iv. 253.

best bells in the world. They considered my proposition—and they bought a bell from Woolwich. They said, 'We want nothing in God's house which will remind us whence we have come.' One's use of the indigenous must always be conditioned by the conscience of one's people. Sometimes it means a long wait.

But there have been some amazing triumphs of grace in this regard. I was charmed by the Telegu lyrics which I heard in South Indian churches, sung to strange one-string fiddles, flutes, tambourines, and cymbals. I thought sadly of the popular hymn in China which still tends to be Sankey on the harmonium. I quote from my India travel diary:

> We saw dancing in the courtyard of the church. The religious dance is something carried over from pre-Christian days. The leader tells a Bible story, *e.g.* the deliverance from Egypt. The dancers form two concentric circles, moving in opposite directions. Each dancer has a stick, and as he passes each member of the other ring he taps his stick. Feet beat rhythmically, sticks tap to the same rhythm, and through it all come the chanted words of the story, with a refrain (like 'The Lord came down to Egypt'), oft repeated, in which all the dancers join. The story advances very slowly and in something like House-that-Jack-built method. Needless to say this is a great means of teaching Bible knowledge. On summer nights they will go on with one story, elaborating it by description of what every one wore, and how every one felt, into the small hours. Whereas if one told a straight story the non-Christian neighbour would be unmoved, and the Christian himself might not remember it.

It reminded me of what happened when the Church was first established among our heathen ancestors. Pope Gregory the Great had already shown his broad-mindedness in his instructions to Augustine not to feel himself bound in any slavish spirit to every detail of the Roman rite:

> 'If you have found anything either in the Roman, Gallican, or any other church, which may be more acceptable to almighty God, carefully make choice of the same, and sedulously teach the church of the English, which as yet is new in the faith, whatsoever you can gather from the several churches. For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things.' [1]

A model of missionary statesmanship is his letter to the Abbot Mellitus whom he sent in the year 601 with reinforcements for the mission: [2] If soundly built, temples are not to be destroyed but cleansed and consecrated, that people may 'more freely resort to the places to which they have been accustomed.' Local usage is to be adopted and baptized, even the 'slaughter of many oxen' for sacrificial feasts; but now the feasting shall be in honour of God and the saints, not of demons. 'He who tries to mount to the highest place must go up by steps and not by leaps.' Gregory even advances in support of this practice the theory that the sacrificial system of Egypt may have influenced the Mosaic ritual. How modern (you may say, how like the author of this article) he sounds, both in his concern for the 'indigenous' and in his search for parallel situations in earlier Church History! We know that something like this procedure does lie behind the foundation even of our most famous churches. The mother-church of English Christianity at Canterbury rose from a ruin already old, 'built by the ancient workmanship of Roman Christians.' [3] Some old churches were not in ruins but had been desecrated by pagan worship since the Anglo-Saxon invasion.[4] These were restored under a general licence from King Ethelbert, and reconsecrated by the Archbishop. Later tradition speaks of the paganism which was supplanted as being that of the great gods of Greece and Rome. Thus Stow, speaking of the discovery near St. Paul's in 1316 of 'bones of oxen and kine,' says that this

> 'confirms greatly the opinion of those which have reported that of old times there had been a temple of Jupiter, and that there was daily a sacrifice of beasts.' [5]

One might more reasonably be reminded of Pope Gregory's letter about the 'slaughter of many oxen' in English pagan feasts. A charter of Westminster Abbey, which is still in the chapter house and is ascribed to King Offa (758–796), speaks of the place of its foundation as '*loco terrabili*'—'a dreadful place,' being quotation of the *Vulgate*, Gn 28^{17}.[6] Later tradition speaks of a ruined temple to Apollo on the site. Roman or English, the reference to a theophany may well imply pre-Christian religious associations.

But if you are surprised at such enlightened tolerance in a bishop of Rome over thirteen centuries ago, it is nothing to my amazement at our mid-nineteenth century missionary predecessors. Remember the attitude among pious evangelicals

[1] Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, i. ch. xxvii.
[2] *Epistles*, xi. 76.
[3] Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, i. ch. xxxiii.
[4] Bright, *Early English Church History*, 61 f.
[5] Quoted by G. E. B. in *Cathedrals*, 8.
[6] Bright, *op. cit.*, 101 f.

towards dancing then. Yet when the call of God had summoned them from their narrow Victorian environment and set them down in an Indian jungle, they were able to take hold of a religious dance and consecrate it to the service of the Church. Can you explain it apart from the grace of God ?

Though the use of indigenous music and original hymns is of later development in China, there you will find other parts of the 'local manifestation' long and well established. Chinese Christians have one festival which is not on our calendar. In the Spring, the males of non-Christian families go out to the family graves. They add more sods to each mound, crowning them all with red paper. They fire crackers to scare away evil influences. They burn 'spirit money' as offerings to the needs of the dead. Christians still keep the Spring festival. They go out men and women together, for in Christ 'there can be no male and female.'[1] They go not by families but in a body, one household of the faith. They sing glad hymns to One who has vanquished death. In prayer they are joined to all the companies of heaven. The festival has become fully Christian.

The story is told of an up-country Chinese merchant who advised an English business acquaintance to try to get hold of a book he had been reading. 'I don't know whether there is an English translation yet. Its name is *New Testament*.' Apocryphal or not, there is this amount of truth in it : parts of the New Testament are better understood in Chinese than in English. In a Chinese family there is a different word for 'brother' when applied to the eldest boy. He has quite a different station. He does really share the parental authority. There is an especially close 'father-firstborn' relationship. There is a ready understanding of the Only-begotten from the Father, who is at the same time the Firstborn of many brethren. In Chinese philosophic thought the *Tao* (Way) has been all but personified—a metaphysical principle which precedes all being ('Silent, ineffable, abiding alone and changing not'[2]), and from which all being proceeds ('Mother of all things . . . loving, nourishing, and ruling all things'). With as much understanding as those who first read John 1 in Greek, Chinese can read :

> 'In the beginning was the *Tao*, and the *Tao* was with God, and the *Tao* was God. . . . and the *Tao* became flesh and dwelt among us. . . .'

Have you ever thought that the Church will not have become truly catholic until wise men of every land have opened their treasures and offered to Him their gifts ? While one of the 'local manifestations' is lacking or undeveloped, the Universal Church itself is incomplete.[3]

It is important to remember, whether your work is in Perth or in Peking, in Tottenham or in Timbuctoo, that that which you serve is the Universal Church, nothing less. How little the ordinary churchgoer has realized it was illustrated when some one asked, 'Why should we take our religion to the Far East ?' I said, 'How long has Christianity been ours ?' For answer I turned up another letter written by Pope Gregory the Great to the Patriarch of Alexandria in the year 597.[4] You will remember that according to Bede's story of the fair-headed slave boys ('Not Angles but Angels'), Gregory could not resist a pun. This letter is further evidence :

> 'The nation of the Angles, *set in an angle of the world*, remained until now believing in the worship of stocks and stones.'

He goes on to tell of the 'happy success' of Augustine's mission. It is not only that he wants to pun. That is how he regards these barbarian kingdoms. So far from our being central in Christendom, he calls us 'the end of the world.' The Church was planted in northern England thirty-eight years later, when Bishop Aidan came from the island of Iona to Holy Isle off the Northumbrian coast. The year 635 is a year to remember. It marks the beginning of the permanent triumph of the faith in this our land. And that same year another bishop, the Persian Alopen, having crossed the highest mountains in the world and some of its most dreadful deserts, arrived at the capital of the greatest civilization upon earth—China.[5] Our Christianity ? For Anglo-Saxons and for Chinese, Church history opens in the very same year !

The Church is not something which belonged to the West, and which, only recently, we have taken East. If we are awarded only a dead heat with the 'heathen Chinee,' we are knocked out of the competition by the Indian. The Church in South India has a tradition of apostolic foundation, which, even if you do not accept it as history, is so

[1] Gal 3^{28}. [2] *Tao-teh-Ching*, the classic of Taoism.

[3] For further illustration of the use of indigenous forms, see H. P. Thompson, *Worship in Other Lands* ; Mabel Shaw, *God's Candlelights* (Rhodesia) ; D. J. Fleming, *Each with His Own Brush* (Christian Art), *Heritage of Beauty* (Architecture), *Christian Symbols in a World Community*.

[4] *Epistles*, viii. 30.

[5] See my *Church of the T'ang Dynasty*.

hard to disprove that you cannot mention in the same breath our legends of Joseph of Arimathæa, the holy grail, and the flowering thorn. The Church was certainly planted in India long before our ancestors were in England at all. The Church was, is, and always will be the *Universal* Church, attaining its local expression in this land and in that, until it shall be so in every land.

It is not only my rather ignorant questioner (above) who did not believe in foreign missions. My concern is a change of attitude in those who do. An old pillar of the church prayed in a missionary prayer meeting, 'Lord, we thank Thee that Thine arm can reach even to China.' As though God were sitting in Britain, but had to lean far over to touch East Asia! Our attitude may never have been such with regard to the Almighty, but most of us have been brought up to think in that way of the Church.

About the year 1690 the Emperor K'ang Hsi complained to the Jesuit fathers, who were in good hope of converting him,

> 'If all this be true, how is it that God waits for over 1600 years before giving us any knowledge of it? How is it that the Chinese are left out, and only the barbarians are mentioned?'

The answer should have been that God did not wait; that from the days of the apostles the Church pushed eastwards; that in spite of man's delays it arrived in 635; that thenceforth, apart from one break (*c.* 1370–1550), the Church is either present in Chinese territory or pressing China-wards.

The question of K'ang Hsi is still asked. In China during the years 1925–8, in India now, whenever and wherever excess of nationalist zeal breaks out, anti-Christians charge the Church with foreign-ness. Christians for the most part have nothing to answer. They themselves are only too conscious of being a late appendage to a predominantly foreign institution. This tragic failure to develop a right church-consciousness in the Younger Churches is due to the fact that we of the Older have failed to apprehend the meaning of the Universal Church.

For all of us Christian history must be presented as being primarily the progress of the Church towards the realization of its universality. Central, and giving meaning to the whole, must be that part of the progress which, in every age, brings the Church nearer towards *my land and me*.[1] Africa, India, the Far East, need to be shown more clearly each its own main line of interest; to know that the Church was never foreign, was always meant to come to them, and was always coming. Men of the modern missionary movement need to know that what they are doing is not transplanting a foreign institution, but making up for delays, failures, faithlessnesses of the past by helping now some thwarted local out-working of the Universal Church —which is the fulfilment of the eternal will of God.

This view makes all our service so much grander and more glorious—and so inevitable.

I repeat, Christianity is represented by two lines, one downward, the Universal Church; one across, the local manifestation. And I venture now to answer what before I asked: It is *not* fanciful to think that it takes both to form the symbol of our faith, the Cross.

[1] I have worked out this idea fairly fully in *The Life of the Church* (Tambaram Madras Series, iv.), 258–271.

Who was the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah liii.?[1]

By the Reverend Professor Christopher R. North, M.A., Handsworth College, Birmingham.

The question which this paper attempts to answer is at least as old as the first Christian century, when the Ethiopian eunuch asked the evangelist Philip, 'Of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other?' The answers that have been given to it are numerous, and bewildering in their variety. The literature on the subject is immense, and as long ago as the year 1800 the German scholar Augusti stated that an annotated bibliography on Is 53 would make a good-sized treatise. Since then there has been a perfect spate of books and articles in at least ten different languages. It is impossible within the compass of this paper to summarize, or even to mention, all the theories that have been put forward; but a brief description of the main lines of the discussion is a necessary preliminary to any attempt we may make to answer the question for ourselves.

Until the close of the eighteenth century Christian writers—with the exception of Grotius, who thought of Jeremiah—were unanimous that Is 53 was Messianic prophecy. This was natural enough, since no one then doubted that the passage, despite its exilic context, was written by a prophet who lived some two centuries before the Exile. But no sooner was there talk of a 'Second Isaiah' than Christian scholars in increasing numbers adopted the view that had long been regnant among the Jews, namely, that the Servant was the nation Israel. This collective theory, in one form or another, held the field until 1892, when Duhm published his commentary on Isaiah,[2] in which he argued that the Servant 'Songs,' as he called them, were not the work of the Second Isaiah, and that the figure portrayed in them was a historical individual. No one, so far as I know, has ever adopted Duhm's 'leprous rabbi' theory; but ever since he wrote, scholarship, particularly in Germany, has tended to move away from the collective to some form or other of individual interpretation.

Many candidates for the title of Servant have been put forward, among them, in the last fifty years, Zerubbabel,[3] Meshullam the son of Zerubbabel,[4] Sheshbazzar,[5] Jehoiachin,[6] Moses,[7] King Uzziah,[8] Eleazar, a martyr of the time of the Maccabees,[9] even Cyrus[10]—Cyrus as the martyred Servant of Is 53! Most of these theories have either been abandoned by, or have died with, their authors. In 1921 the Norwegian scholar, Sigmund Mowinckel, published a brochure[11] which has been almost as influential as Duhm's Commentary. Let us cease, he said, to play blind-man's buff among all the known and unknown figures of the exilic and post-exilic periods, and recognize that the answer to the enigma is implicit in the question of the Ethiopian eunuch. Of whom should the Prophet be speaking if not of himself? The suggestion has been adopted by a number of famous scholars, including the redoubtable Ernst Sellin, who had already three times, and each time finally, solved the problem by proposing in turn Zerubbabel, Jehoiachin, and Moses. In 1931, ten years after he had made it, Mowinckel[12] abandoned his own theory because it had committed him to the extremely hazardous assumption that the Prophet wrote the account of his own death. To conclude this brief initial summary, during the last century and a half the Messianic interpretation has never been without its advocates, both Catholic and

[1] An address read at the Annual Commemoration Service of Handsworth College, Birmingham, on 3rd November 1939.

[2] *Das Buch Jesaia übersetzt und erklärt.*

[3] E. Sellin, *Serubbabel. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des messianischen Erwartung und der Entstehung des Judentums* (1898).

[4] J. L. Palache, *The 'Ebed-Jahveh Enigma in Pseudo-Isaiah* (Amsterdam, 1934).

[5] H. Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen.* Zweite Reihe, iii. (1901) 452 f.

[6] E. Sellin, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der jüdischen Gemeinde nach dem babylonischen Exil. I. Der Knecht Gottes bei Deuterojesaja* (1901); *Das Rätsel des deuterojesajanischen Buches* (1908).

[7] E. Sellin, *Mose und seine Bedeutung für die israelitisch-jüdische Religionsgeschichte* (1922).

[8] K. Dietze, *Ussia der Knecht Gottes* (Bremen, 1929).

[9] A. Bertholet, *Zu Jesaja 53: Ein Verklärungsversuch* (1899).

[10] T. H. Weir, 'A New Theory of the "Servant of Jehovah" in Isaiah 40–55' (*Westminster Review*, clxix. (1909) 309–314).

[11] *Der Knecht Jahwäs.*

[12] 'Die Komposition des deuterojesajanischen Buches' (*Z.A.W.*, 1931).

Protestant, fundamentalist and critic. And, as we might expect, there are not wanting those who see in the Servant a figure akin to Tammuz, a refinement of the myth of the dying and rising god.

To-day the theories still held, and which have a claim to serious attention, may be reduced to four.

(1) There is the theory that the Servant was an anonymous contemporary of the Second Isaiah, a man who, the Prophet believed, was destined to be the Messiah. This solution, which may be termed historico-messianic, was first proposed by Rudolf Kittel,[1] and elaborated by Wilhelm Rudolph,[2] in Germany, and is represented in this country by Prebendary Oesterley.[3] It has been subjected to criticism by Volz[4] along these lines: Is it likely that there lived, at the same time as Deutero-Isaiah, a yet greater leader and prophet who has remained quite unknown to us? Further, does not Rudolph's hypothesis altogether misplace the emphasis of the poems? It lays the stress upon the political elements in the person and work of the Servant, whereas these are throughout of only secondary importance.

To this we may add, does not the relation between Servant and Prophet present an unsurmountable psychological difficulty? The Servant, as he makes his first appearance to the Prophet, looks the most unlikely person to be a political leader. He had, indeed, no such pretensions—here I am summarizing Rudolph's own argument—and his claim to the Prophet's admiration at first consisted solely in his conception of a world-mission. It needed the Prophet to point out to him what he really was. In this the Prophet appears to be greater than he. Unfortunately, the Prophet fired him with enthusiasm for less spiritual objectives, in the pursuance of which he met his death. In other words, the Servant needed the Prophet to make him fully conscious of himself, and then fell a victim to the Prophet's enthusiasm for the political liberation of Israel. Surely we should hesitate before implying that the Prophet, who so reverenced the Servant, was really his evil genius. The association of the two men, as Rudolph imagines it, was not altogether fortunate, and as a result neither of them is quite as great as we had thought him.

(2) The second theory which we must briefly examine is that which would make the Servant the Prophet himself. We may call it for convenience the autobiographical theory. I have said that Mowinckel, who originated it, no longer believes that the last Song was composed by the Prophet. Indeed, he now denies that any of the Songs is by the Prophet, and in so far as he has any positive opinion about the identity of the Servant it is only that the figure described in Is 53 is a 'cult-hero delineated with mythological colouring,' possibly reminiscent of the presumably martyred Deutero-Isaiah. At the same time I should say that as recently as the end of last year Joachim Begrich, of Leipzig, published a volume of studies in Deutero-Isaiah,[5] in which he so far revives Mowinckel's original thesis that he thinks that the Servant was the Prophet, and that the Prophet wrote all the Songs. But the most confident exposition of the autobiographical theory is that of Sellin,[6] elaborated by Karl Elliger.[7] These two scholars think that the last Song was written by Trito-Isaiah, the disciple of Deutero-Isaiah, as a threnody upon his martyred master.

Now if it could be proved that the last Song was by an intimate and clearly recognizable disciple of Deutero-Isaiah, the Sellin-Elliger modification of the autobiographical theory might be very strong indeed. But, to begin with, the unity of Is 56–66 —a condition precedent to our being able to think of an individual person to be called Trito-Isaiah—is not the general view of Old Testament scholars, despite Elliger's pleadings. Further, an examination of Elliger's argument has convinced me that his proofs of the Trito-Isaianic authorship of Is 52, 53 have nothing of the cogency that he claims for them. This is not the occasion for going into the matter in detail. That, in all probability, will have to wait until after the war is over.

On the general question, the fundamental difficulty about the autobiographical theory is that it limits the horizon of the Songs. When we read Sellin, Elliger, and Begrich, we are left wondering why the Gentiles receive such prominence in the Songs as they unquestionably do. In the Songs the Servant is destined to be 'a light to the Gentiles,' not failing nor being discouraged until he has accomplished his task. Unless the Prophet-Servant

[1] *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iii. (1927) and earlier works.

[2] 'Der exilische Messias' (*Z.A.W.*, 1925), 'Die Ebed-Jahwe als geschichtliche Wirklichkeit' (*Z.A.W.*, 1928).

[3] W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, *Hebrew Religion: its Origin and Development*[2] (1937).

[4] P. Volz, *Jesaia II übersetzt und erklärt* (1932).

[5] *Studien zu Deuterojesaja* (1938).

[6] 'Tritojesaja, Deuterojesaja und das Gottesknechtsproblem' (*Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1930); 'Die Lösung des deuterojesajanischen Gottesknechtsrätsels' (*Z.A.W.*, 1937).

[7] *Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Tritojesaja* (1933).

was a dreamer doomed to complete disillusionment, we expect that he should go at least some way toward realizing the destiny ordained for him by God. Not only did he not do this, but the exponents of the autobiographical theory appear to say that nothing of the kind was ever seriously intended for him, nor even by him. Thus, the first Song is ostensibly addressed by Yahweh to an unspecified, but presumably wide, audience; the second by the Servant to the world at large; the third is a monologue of the Servant; the last is put partly into the mouth of Yahweh, partly into the mouth of other speakers—whether Israelites or Gentiles is disputed. Sellin, Elliger, and Begrich press the Songs, which are unique, into the now fashionable Psalm-types of monologues, dialogues with God, words of comfort to the Prophet, thanksgivings of the Prophet to God, which the Prophet only committed to a small circle of disciples. We are left wondering why they are so concerned about the Gentiles, since the Prophet was not destined, either in fact, or, apparently in intention, to exercise the ministry described for him. It is possible that the Songs were only committed to a small circle of disciples, and such a possibility is quite consistent with most theories of the Servant. It is, however, difficult to reconcile it with the autobiographical theory, and yet the exponents of that theory, paradoxically, seem the most concerned to limit the scope of the Servant's opportunities. It is the price they have to pay for the necessity that is laid upon them of proving that the Songs do not break through the bounds of the rest of the prophecy. They do not, they cannot, in view of the plain language of the Songs, deny that the Servant has a mission to the Gentiles; but they minimize that element in the Songs as much as they can, and they put the Prophet in a position that makes it impossible for him to exercise the wider ministry. The references to the Gentiles seem superfluous embroidery, since the Gentiles are hardly allowed even the rôle of a Chorus.

(3) Amongst current solutions of the problem that have to be seriously considered we must obviously reckon the collective theory. It is the theory most commonly held in this country, largely due to the powerful advocacy of it by the late Dr. Peake and by Principal Wheeler Robinson, and to the fact that our three commentaries on Isaiah, the Cambridge, the Century, and the Westminster, all present it, though in different forms. The theory, indeed, has taken many forms, empirical Israel, ideal Israel, the pious remnant of the true Israel, and so on, together with combinations of these elements in different proportions. The most recent, as well as the most attractive form of the theory, is that associated with the names of Principal Wheeler Robinson,[1] and Professor Otto Eissfeldt of Halle,[2] whose views, published independently, are nevertheless strikingly similar. There is no need for a lengthy description of Principal Robinson's exposition, since it is easily accessible and well known. He examines two objections to the collective interpretation. In answer to the first, namely 'that the portrait is too special and elaborate in its details to represent any group,' he shows convincingly that elsewhere in the Old Testament there are passages, unquestionably referring to communities, in which we have an equal 'descriptive individualism' to that of the Songs. The second objection, 'that . . . a real distinction seems to be made between the work of the Servant and the national life as its sphere of operation,' is, he admits, more difficult to answer. He allows, what most advocates of the full collective theory have strenuously disputed, namely that the Servant has a mission to Israel; but he proposes to transcend the antithesis by reference to the ancient idea of corporate personality. That idea, he says, is consistent with a 'fluidity of conception, a possibility of swift transition from the one to the many, and vice versa, to which our thought and language have no real parallel.' When, therefore, we set the individual and collective views over against one another as contraries, are we not arguing 'on an antithesis true to modern, but false to ancient modes of thought?' There is, in some sort, 'truth in each of the rival views,' even in Mowinckel's. 'We are to think of the Prophet's consciousness as capable of a systole and diastole, an ebb and a flow, so that though he utters his own experience in the service of Yahweh, it is always with the sense implicit or explicit that these things are true of all the devout disciples of Yahweh, and that *they* are Israel.' At its widest extent we cannot rest content with anything less than the equation the Servant *is* Israel, for only so can we 'do justice to the imposing scale of the treatment.' At the same time what we have in the Songs is 'essentially an individual experience,' and 'in fact if not in form' the Prophet 'must be thinking of the experiences of those to whom

[1] *The Cross of the Servant* (1926), 'The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality' (*Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*, edited by P. Volz, F. Stummer, and J. Hempel, 1936).

[2] 'The Ebed-Jahwe in Isaiah xl.–lv.' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xliv. (1933) 261.

religion was a reality . . . ; probably in his deepest thoughts the Prophet stood alone, . . . and was projecting his own consciousness into that of men of lower spirituality.'

The attractiveness of this exposition is obvious. I was first led to question it when Principal Robinson, in a paper read at Göttingen four years ago, said that the Prophet was conscious of no contrast during the expansion from the smaller to the larger mission of the Servant. 'He (*i.e.* the Prophet) *is* Israel created to be the Servant; he is Israel, though working alone to make Israel what she ought to be; he is Israel finally become a light of nations to the end of the earth.' But is not this to think of the Prophet-Servant too much after the fashion of a modern pastor of souls, whose business is exclusively with the spiritual welfare of his flock? Part of the Servant's task is 'to raise up the tribes of Jacob,' and that—note the word 'tribes'—not only admits of a political reference, but even seems to require one. If we say that in the Old Testament political and spiritual well-being are inseparable, the case remains the same. The message of Deutero-Isaiah is largely concerned with the expectation of a return to the homeland, and the Servant is to be the instrument for the accomplishment of this. That being so, it is difficult to see how the Prophet-Servant could be conscious of no contrast between himself and the nation, since he was really committed to leading the nation back from exile. If we admit that we are either back at the full autobiographical theory, with the problem of ch. 53 still on our hands, or we must look for some other individual Servant.

(4) We have, so far, felt obliged to reject every one of the theories which would regard the Servant as a historical individual. Our examination of the collective theory has driven us back to think of an individual who, if he cannot be historical, must be in some sort an ideal figure. Not, of course, 'ideal' in the sense of Plato's ideal man, existing only in the philosophic and religious imagination, but ideal in the sense that—and here lies the difference—it was the confident expectation of the Prophet that he would appear.

Mention must here be made of the fourth main theory to which I referred earlier, namely, the Messianic. For a century after the rise of criticism the defenders of the Messianic theory were almost, if not quite, without exception fundamentalists, whether Catholic or Protestant. During the last fifty years, however, a number of works[1] have appeared advocating a Messianic interpretation, while at the same time often frankly admitting that the writer of the Servant passages lived during the Exile. Most of them, though not all, have sought to show that the Servant of the Songs is none other than the Davidic Messiah of Is 9 and 11. This is to over-emphasize the political features in the portrait, and if we are to advocate a Messianic interpretation, it must be with the qualification that the Servant of Is 53 differs as much from the traditional Messiah as Jesus of Nazareth subsequently did.

(*To be continued.*)

[1] Notably L. Ley, *Historische Erklärung des zweiten Teils des Jesaja* (1893); Feldmann, *Der Knecht Gottes in Isaias Kap.* 40–55 (1907); J. Fischer, *Isaias* 40–55 *und die Perikopen vom Gottesknecht* (1916), *Wer ist der Ebed in den Perikopen* Is. 42^{1-7}. *u.s.w.?* (1922); H. Gressmann, *Der Messias* (1929), J. S. van der Ploeg, *Les Chants du Serviteur de Jahvé* (1936). Feldmann, Fischer, and Ploeg are Catholics, and therefore obliged to keep within the terms of the Biblical Commission of 1908. The general practice of Catholic exegetes is to say that the historical background of Is 40–55 is the Exile, and then go ahead with much the same freedom as any one else. Fischer's work is, on the whole, the solidest and most objective treatment the subject has ever received.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Little Sir Echo.

By the Reverend S. Greer, M.A., Ayr.

'None of his words fall to the ground.'—I S 3^{19}.

You know the song about the lonely child who wanted a friend to play with and one day found Little Sir Echo. It is a real adventure to discover an echo. You call out a word, and the word comes back. But you only get back what you sent out. You shout a cheery 'Hallo!' and back comes a cheerful 'Hallo!' You cry 'Friend!' and back comes 'Friend!' You call angrily 'Wretch!' and the echo insults you in turn.

It is like the Mirror Maze you visit in a Fun Fair. You enter a queer house, and on your right hand and on the left are reflections of You, You, You. You turn a corner, and almost run into yourself. You see somebody approaching, and dodge to avoid colliding with—yourself. Always You, You, You. At first it is a laughing You, but if the maze is longer than your patience, it is by and by a rather bored You. But, smiling or cross, it is always yourself you meet.

I know a lad who is always running into himself in real life. He says everybody has a grudge against him. Really it is his own unhappy and grudging self he is confronting everywhere. He is rude and ungenerous, and gets rudeness and ungenerous treatment in return. Be helpful, and you will find there are ever so many helpful folk about you. Grouse and the world will grouse at you, but if you are a cheerful kind of person you will find kindly eyes smiling back to you. If you go out in the morning feeling grumpy, you'll meet the grumpiest folk ever. It's yourself you've been meeting—running up against yourself all day. Just watch the faces round you; you'll learn quite a lot about yourself. Listen to Little Sir Echo; he'll tell you much that may be good for you to hear.

Here is an experiment you may try on the first person you meet to-morrow, should it be rainy. Say to that person: 'What a wretched day!' The answer will be: 'Yes. Perfectly disgusting!' And you both go on your way feeling quite miserable. Now suppose you said: 'Jolly fine weather for the garden! Just what the vegetables were needing.' Your friend will probably answer: 'Yes, and aren't our vegetables coming on!' And you both go on your way feeling better, thinking that, after all, what's good for the garden can't be bad for you, and in any case your comfort isn't the only consideration. Little Sir Echo may be the next person you meet in the street.

A poet tells us that he once shot an arrow which flew out of sight, and years later he found it in an oak. What we do, what we say, quite often comes back most strangely. In a Scottish village a Russian gentleman was very hospitably entertained by the head of a business firm, who afterwards showed him his lovely rose garden. Long years afterwards this business man's son, travelling in Russia during the Revolution, was in great difficulties. He was not allowed to leave for home. At length he applied to a very high official who questioned him about his name, his home town, his business. Then the Russian asked the astonishing question: 'And has your father still got his rose garden?' He was the guest of years ago, and there was no more trouble after that. It is not just their words that come back to people in echo; often the kindness they did is returned mysteriously upon them.

So you see there's a great deal of truth about Sir Echo. Shouldn't that make us feel rather solemn every morning when we go out? What we say, what we do, what we are, go so far and may come back upon us, or upon others. Not one word shall fall to the ground. Shall we not ask God each day to instruct our tongue, to guide our feet, and to cleanse our heart, so that Sir Echo may not put us to shame?

The Green-Eyed Monster.

By Professor Norman V. Hope, B.D., New Brunswick, New Jersey.

'Never envy . . . but always reverence.'—Pr 23^{17} (Moffatt).

You will all have heard of Sir Walter Scott, the great Scottish author. Perhaps you have already read some of his poems, like 'Marmion,' and his novels such as *The Fair Maid of Perth*. If you haven't yet read Scott's works, then there's a treat in store for you.

Sir Walter, when a boy, went to the High School of Edinburgh. At school he was not a very out-

standing pupil. In his class, however, there was one boy who was always at the top; he always came with his lessons prepared, and could answer all the questions put to him. Scott noticed that whenever this boy was asked a question by the teacher he fumbled for a certain button in his waistcoat; when he had found it, he twisted it round, and—lo and behold!—the answer came to him at once. Now Scott was very jealous of this boy; so one day, seeing the boy's waistcoat hanging up, he (Scott) cut off the button. Next day the boy, who hadn't noticed his loss, was asked a question in class. He fumbled for his button as usual; but it wasn't there. He became so confused that he couldn't answer the question. Scott, sitting farther down the class, was able to supply the correct answer; and so he was promoted to the top. And though the other boy no doubt had his missing button replaced, he never managed to get back again to the top of the class.

Now probably young Scott thought at the time that he'd been very clever in outwitting his rival, of whom he was so jealous. But in later years, when he had grown wiser, he came to realize something of the wrong he had done to the other boy; and he bitterly regretted his youthful act of petty jealousy. He saw that it hadn't done the other boy any good at all; and, in truth, it hadn't done him (Scott) any real good either.

The Bible has quite a lot to say about the evil of jealousy. Right at the beginning of the Bible the story is told of Cain's jealousy of his brother Abel, and of the terrible results to which that jealousy led. The Book of Numbers tells, in chapter 12, of Miriam's jealousy of her brother Moses, and of the penalty which she suffered for it. The New Testament even says, in Mk 15^{19}, that it was for envy that Jesus Christ was delivered up by the Jewish leaders to Pontius Pilate, who allowed Him to be put to death.

Those who know human life best agree entirely with the Bible in pointing out the evils of jealousy. Shakespeare called it 'the green-eyed monster,' and wrote a great play about it, called *Othello*. And the late Sir James Barrie, the well-known writer of plays, once called jealousy 'the root of all evil.'

Perhaps already you know something of how common is jealousy, and how evil. And the only effective cure for it that has ever yet been found is the love of Jesus Christ in the heart. If you have His love in your heart, instead of envying and even hating other people for their gifts and talents and whatever other things they may have, you will rejoice in them, and will thank God for them. 'Never envy,' says the wise author of the Book of Proverbs, 'but always reverence.'

The Christian Year.

Sexagesima.

The Voice of God.

'Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live.'—Jn 5^{25}.

The difference between an ordinary self-centred, mundane existence, and the new career on which Christ launches the soul is the difference *between death and life*. That is the New Testament's reiterated verdict. Without scruple or hesitation those men lay hold of the most startling and dramatic metaphor within their reach, and use that to describe the difference Christ has made. 'We know that we have passed from death unto life.' Nor is that simply their unsupported testimony. It stands as Christ's verdict too. 'This my son was dead—and is alive!' Now the question arises, Can such a use of language be justified? Does it not look as if those writers of the New Testament, carried away with the fervour of the newly converted, have allowed their rhetoric to outrun their logic? That may be our first feeling. But maturer reflection will disclose that they are not after all striving after effect or lapsing into crude, naïve hyperbole: they are speaking sober truth. They are accurately transcribing experience. Ask any one who has deeply felt the liberating, vitalizing touch of Christ upon his soul, and he will tell you—'Only then did I begin to live!'

Consider, for one thing, the appalling *aimlessness* of so much human life in this modern world. The highroad of life that stretches from the cradle to the grave is full to-day of people wandering about with no sense of a direction or a goal. Hither and thither they keep rushing, restlessly preoccupied, driven to and fro by strong, conflicting hungers and instincts and desires, pursuing now one prize, now another, absorbed in money-making, love-making, war-making, peace-making, career-making—and yet, in spite of it all, dissatisfied, bored, unhappy. Why? Because the whole thing seems so senseless, unco-ordinated, devoid of plan and purpose. And indeed, if a man has no ultimate scale of values to give integration to his life and meaning to his struggles; if deep within his secret heart there is no throne where certain regnant

convictions hold unchallenged and commanding sway; if 'earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust' is the last word when the brief kaleidoscope of threescore years and ten is over, how pathetically hollow life becomes!

Sad as the wind that sweeps across the ocean
Telling to earth the sorrow of the sea,
Vain is my strife, just empty idle motion,
All that has been is all there is to be.

There is another kind of deadness besides that of aimlessness—the deadness of *formality*. 'I know thy works,' declares the Christ of the Revelation to the Church at Sardis; 'thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead.' If you were to find a Church one day which had no expectancy in its prayers, no warmth and welcome in its fellowship, no fire or passion in its work for the Master, no feeling of being 'lost in wonder, love, and praise' before the mighty acts of redeeming grace, no hushed, awed sense of a divine presence in its sacraments, no kindled blaze of missionary ardour—what would you say of such a Church? Was the New Testament wrong in nailing down formality in religion as enmity to Christ, the very negation and antithesis of the spirit of life?

But there is a third condition, beyond aimlessness and formality, which the New Testament describes as *death*. 'You were dead in trespasses and sins,' declares Paul. We know that in the realm of organic nature, faculties, and capacities which are left lying idle and unused inevitably atrophy and decay. So in the region of the soul. Let a man neglect conscience long enough, and conscience will cease to speak. Let him abandon himself to evil thoughts and habits, and gradually the whole spiritual universe will take its revenge by rendering him insensitive and blind to higher things, incapable of appreciating the beauty of holiness or of discerning the reality of God. 'Verily,' said Jesus, in one deep, solemnizing verdict, 'they have their reward'—they get what they have set their hearts upon, they end up chained to the worthless things they have chosen. 'To be carnally minded is death.'

What then is to be done? The fact is, there is one point at which man, in spite of all his other wonderful achievements, stands helpless and baffled and defeated: he cannot create life. Not all the labours of his hands, not all the ingenuity of his brain, not all the passion of his heart, can work the everlasting miracle of revivification and renascence. He may roll away the stone from the grave: he can't wake the dead. Yet nothing else will satisfy.

'Tis life, whereof our nerves are scant,
Oh life, not death, for which we pant;
More life, and fuller, that I want.

Is that quest doomed for ever?

The answer is here: 'The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead *shall hear a voice*.' At the coming of the sound of a voice, an aimless world, a formal Church, a sin-entombed soul, will stand up and live! How often the hearing of a voice has changed the whole aspect of the world! But which voice? The world is full of clamorous, conflicting voices. To whose voice must we hearken now?

Some would tell us that what we need for our regenerating is the voice of the scientist. Is that true? Let us indeed thank that voice for all it has told us of the majesty and marvel of the universe; but let us also remember, as Reinhold Niebuhr has put it, that 'science can sharpen the fangs of ferocity as much as it can alleviate human pain.' 'We are living now,' says Aldous Huxley, in that deeply significant book, *Ends and Means*, 'not in the delicious intoxication induced by the early successes of science, but in a rather grisly morning-after, when it has become apparent that what triumphant science has done hitherto is to improve the means for achieving unimproved or actually deteriorated ends.' No, the voice of science may tell us of a thousand mysteries: it cannot smite death with resurrection!

Shall we hearken, then, to the voice of the moralist, the philosopher? His voice will tell us of the road to beauty, truth, and goodness. But what is the good of knowing the road if we have not got the power or the vitality to walk? The moralist can fashion an ethic or promulgate a code. But confront him with Ezekiel's problem of the dry bones in the valley of death, and he is helpless: he cannot regiment them into a marching army, nor breathe into their deadness the breath of life.

Will the voice of the Church, then, do it? Here in the midst of life, thrusting the eternal issues upon a confused, uproarious world distracted between Vanity Fair and Armageddon, stands this strange fact, the Church. And sad will be the world's fate if ever the Church should cease to care for the souls of men, or the voice of the Church cry aloud no longer in pleading and in challenge. Yet I do not find that Peter and John, encountering a poor cripple at the gate of the temple, cried—'In the name of the Church, rise up and walk.'

'The hour cometh when the dead shall hear *the voice of the Son of God*.' This is the voice, the only

voice, which can echo down into the dark deeps where my spirit lies dead in its aimlessness, formality, and sin. 'Hark, my soul, it is the Lord!'

Have you ever listened to its tones? Sometimes it is a still small voice, like music far away, a whisper of hope when all is dark, to comfort and encourage and chase the shadows from your soul. Sometimes it is a trumpet-call, a battle-cry, a voice no longer gentle and appealing, but masterful and mighty and impassioned: 'Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light!' Sometimes it murmurs, 'Come, weary soul, come unto Me, and rest.' Sometimes it blazes forth, castigating all lethargy and comfortable complacence, 'Son of man, gird on thine armour, and fight! Rise up, O man of God!'

But whatever its tones, it tells of life made new. 'The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; *and they that hear shall live.*' 'The dead shall hear the voice'—not of the great Teacher, not of the Jesus of the Galilean road—'the voice of *the Son of God,*' the voice (that is) of death's Conqueror, of One who ever since the dawning of the first Easter day has held all Resurrection power in His keeping, and reigns the Lord of life for ever. Read the very next words following our text, and you will find that made explicit: 'For as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself.' Don't you see now how Christ achieves the seemingly impossible? He can give you life, by imparting Himself to you, by making His dwelling with you—for He *is* life. That is the secret. If Shakespeare were in you, what poetry you could write! If Beethoven were in you, what music you could compose! If Christ were in you, what a life you could live! If? There need be no if about it. You can't have an indwelling Shakespeare or Beethoven. You *can* have an indwelling Christ. You can say with Paul, 'I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' Then your spirit has cast off all its bonds and come alive! Then

> From the ground there blossoms red
> Life that shall endless be.[1]

QUINQUAGESIMA.

Love of God.

'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment.'—Mt $22^{37f.}$.

'Thou shalt love.' How strange it is, when we come to think of it, that we should be *commanded* to love. Love is a feeling which does not spring up at the summons of another. You cannot command love. You cannot put it forcibly into any one's heart by the exercise of authority. You may tell a man that he ought to love, and he will reply, 'Yes, I know I ought, but all the same I don't, and I can't.' Love has an independence of its own. It comes and goes, it waxes and wanes, without any conscious effort of our will, almost without our knowing why. But to the average Jew of our Lord's time, familiar with the words from his childhood, and bound by his religion to recite the passage from Deuteronomy twice every day, the commandment would have presented no difficulty. To Jesus Himself it presented no difficulty. That was not because He was careless as to whether He was commanding an impossibility. On the contrary, He was always most careful not to force His teaching on men against their judgment or will. He always respected human personality. He took into account the mental and moral atmosphere of the individual soul. He said to the doubter, 'If thou canst believe.' He led His disciples gradually on to see things for themselves, and to make the truths which He was teaching them their own. When He said, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,' He was not insisting on something which men could not do: He was setting an ideal before them which it was in their power to attain, if only they made the effort. Love cannot be constrained by a command, but it can be won by an appeal. An appealing love draws out an answering love, and it was this appealing love of God which Jesus made known to men. There are still masses of our fellow-men who do not love God, who hardly, indeed, think of Him at all, but all have the power, and all would have the desire, to love Him if only they could be brought to think of Him and to feel the reality of His love for them.

The originality of our Lord's teaching about the duty of loving God lay, not in the commandment itself—that He was quoting from Deuteronomy—but in the special pre-eminence which He gave it. It was not *a* commandment, but *the* commandment. It stood apart from the Ten Commandments. Incidentally, indeed, the second commandment of the Decalogue makes a reference to it when it says that God shows mercy unto thousands of them that love Him, but in Christ's new interpretation of the law of Moses the Decalogue itself became subordinate to this first and great commandment. Love—whether of God or of man—became the fulfilling of the law: love became the foundation of personal religion and the test of religious character. The

[1] J. S. Stewart, *The Strong Name*, 58.

first question which Christ virtually asked His would-be followers was this: 'Do you love God above all things? Are you seeking *first* the kingdom of God and His righteousness?' This command to love is the one command, says Dr. Anderson Scott, given by Jesus which He intended to apply to all men, under all circumstances, and at all times.

We all know that there is another and a lower aspect under which religion has often presented itself to men. Instead of making the love of God the groundwork of their religion, Christians have far too frequently taken their own salvation as their aim, and fear of future punishment as their motive. To some minds at some periods no religious motive has been so forcible as the fear of eternal punishment. 'What shall I do to be saved?' is the most natural question that a man can ask when he is turning for the first time from the bondage of sin to the service of God. But this question ought only to be a stepping-stone to higher aims and motives. The Christian has to learn to pass from self to selflessness. If he never reaches the further stage he is surely dethroning the first and great commandment of Jesus from its rightful place. The love of self may be perfectly proper and justifiable within certain limits and on certain occasions, but it must not stand in the way of the love of God. It is good for us all to try to see clearly the wide difference between these two aspects of religion. The man who is religious because he loves God for His own sake, and the man who is religious because it is his interest to be so, stand on very different ground; the one keeps, and the other does not keep, the first and great commandment. When we think of self in any form, there must needs be some tinge of selfishness imparted to us.

And yet it may be questioned whether the love of God as felt by human beings here on earth can ever be entirely pure. Absolute disinterestedness could hardly perhaps be claimed for the greatest saint that ever lived. Reward is not the motive of his love—it is only an unworthy love that looks for recompense—but it *is* the consequence of his love, and as such it has to be taken into account. He thinks of St. Paul's words: 'We know that all things work together for good to them that love God.'

'With all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.' We are to love God with every power of our nature—emotional, moral, and intellectual. Wholeheartedness in our love toward God means that God—the God of mercy and loving-kindness—ought to stand alone as an object of love. To idolize any human being is to lack a sense of proportion in our expenditure of love. It is bad for the person idolized, and it is bad for the person idolizing. The unchangeableness of God makes our love of Him different from any type of human love; it supplies a sense of calmness and steadfastness and strength. People sometimes ask how can we love a Being whose nature so infinitely transcends our own? We cannot get very far beyond the analogy of the little child's attitude to his father. With our love we must mingle a good deal of trust, a good deal of hope, and a certain amount of awe. The idea of familiarity with God is repugnant to every devout and reverent heart.

Then, secondly, 'with all thy soul.' The soul is that which constitutes most truly the man's personality. We may interpret it as the human will and conscience. Here we get a new aspect of God as the object of our love. It is no longer His mercy and loving-kindness which we have placed before us, but His holiness and purity. The thought of this Divine moral greatness often strangely moves men's love. All that is best and noblest in their nature seems to vibrate in unison with His moral perfection. To love God with one's whole soul is to love Him with the whole force of one's deepest moral convictions; it is to have one's love of Him backed by an enlightened conscience and a steadfast will; and, above all, it is to keep His commandments because one loves Him.

And lastly, 'with one's whole mind.' There is an intellectual side to love. Love and knowledge are sometimes contrasted, but they are not really very far apart. The more a man loves God the more he knows about God. Love's quick intuitions may outstrip the slower processes of reason. But love cannot usurp the place of reason in the religious life. God wishes you to use your intelligence about religion as about everything else. Try to follow the spirit of the Psalmist when he says, 'Lord, what love have I unto thy law; all the day long is my study in it.' Never forget that the object of your love is not merely the God of mercy, not merely the God of holiness, but also the God of truth.[1]

First Sunday in Lent.

Life's Inevitabilities.

'But in everything commending ourselves, as ministers of God . . . in necessities.'—2 Co 6[4] (R.V.).

Perhaps this paragraph is specially for ministers, for in it Paul describes his own conduct as a preacher.

[1] H. G. Woods, *Christianity and War*, 161.

Paul was jealous of his reputation as a Christian minister. He knew how largely the acceptance of the gospel depended on the character and conduct of the man who preached it. He knew how honourable and unselfish behaviour on the part of the preacher would predispose men to listen to his message.

While we admit that a special responsibility rests upon ministers, we are all of us responsible in greater or less degree in this matter of furthering or hindering the progress of the gospel. By character and conduct we are all of us either commending or discrediting our Christian faith. And it is for us to see to it that we do not by foolish or unworthy conduct put any stumbling-block in another's way. Paul preached the gospel of the love of God, and his conduct confirmed that gospel. For when it was blackest night with him, he could sing, so sure was he of the love of God. He commended himself as a true minister of God by the gallantry and courage with which he faced life's trials and difficulties and calamities. How we face up to the inevitable difficulties and hardships which life brings is a pretty accurate test of the reality of our faith in God.

'Commending ourselves, as ministers of God . . . in necessities.' Perhaps what the Apostle had specially in mind was 'narrow circumstances,' conditions in which supplies were reduced to the barest minimum. Paul knew what it was to be hungry. But we may use it to include other circumstances —some of those great and dread experiences which not one of us is able to avoid. There are certain hardships which come to some but which others escape. But there are other hard experiences which are common to us all. And how we face up to these inevitabilities reveals the measure of our faith in God.

1. Take that matter of *physical weakness* to begin with. Some enjoy a much larger measure of vigour and health than others do—but sooner or later we all of us become acquainted with the touch of pain. Well, how do we bear it when it comes? Some people become querulous and fretful. Others just set their teeth and go through with it. But the man who has a real faith will bear it all with a certain cheerful courage, knowing he is in his Father's hands.

How do we bear *our* inevitabilities? For probably each one of us has his own particular handicap. In life there are some things we have just got to accept. We can't escape them. We can't alter them. And half of the art of life lies in learning to accept things with a brave and cheerful spirit. Half the misery of life is caused because people, instead of accepting cheerfully and bravely things which they can't either change or escape, rebel against them and fret and fume and repine. That kind of conduct simply adds to the total sum of human unhappiness. The world would be an infinitely happier place if we learned to accept things. That is hard for a man who has no faith in God. But it ought not to be impossible for the man who believes in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who believes that Love rules and therefore all things must work together for good to them that love God. Have we learned the art of accepting things? Robert Hall, the great Baptist preacher, used to be subject to paroxysms of pain in the course of which he would roll in sheer agony. But, when the paroxysm was over, the first words he used to say were these: 'I hope I didn't complain.' Complaint, in Robert Hall's view of things, was unfitting in a man who professed to believe in a God of love. When we learn to bear our pains and sickness with a brave courage and a serene trust we shall be commending ourselves as real believers in God—giving proof of the efficacy of our gospel.

2. Take again the matter of *temptation*. That again is one of life's inevitabilities. Some people may be tempted more fiercely than others, though, indeed, it is extraordinarily difficult for us to estimate the strength of the temptations to which other people are exposed. We read in our newspapers of certain trades which they speak of as 'sheltered trades,' trades which are not exposed to the fluctuations to which other trades are subject. But there are no callings or conditions 'sheltered' against temptation. There may be some who find themselves in circumstances where the temptations are terribly strong. Those Christians who were members of Cæsar's household must have had a hard fight of it to keep themselves unspotted from the world. But while some may be specially tried, no one is exempt. As long as we are in this world we are being continually tempted to sacrifice the eternal for the temporal, heaven for earth, the soul for the flesh. So it is of no use imagining we can escape temptation. We cannot, except by being taken out of the world, and Jesus did not pray that we should be taken out of the world, only that we should be kept from the evil that is in it. Well, how do we face this inevitability? Do we fret and complain that we are hardly used and that our lot is a difficult one? Or are we like the New Testament Christians who met their temptations with a certain gaiety of spirit? They

knew that greater was He that was with them than all that were against them. They knew that they could overcome through Him that loved them. 'Count it all joy,' writes St. James, and James was a severely practical person, 'when ye fall into divers temptations, for when ye have been proved ye shall receive the crown of life.' 'He is able to make you stand,' says the Apostle Paul, and 'stand' they did, though they had trials of mockings and scourgings, moreover of bonds and imprisonments. God was able to make them stand.

Dr. John Kelman in one of his books suggested that if we found ourselves in places of special difficulty, we ought to be proud of the fact, for it was proof that God had a special confidence in us. He had sufficient trust in us to believe that even in a hard place we would keep our Christian name unsullied. A soldier doesn't fret and grumble when he is assigned some task of special difficulty and danger. He accepts it as a compliment to his courage and skill. And if we find ourselves in a hard place, that is how we should regard it—as God's compliment to our courage. We should face our temptations with courage. When we fret and complain and make moan we act as if there were no God pledged to help and keep and save. But when we face our temptations without flinching we commend ourselves as ministers of God, and we help men to believe that there is something real and worth while in the gospel which we profess.

3. One other inevitability is the *inevitable end*. The one thing absolutely certain about life is that it must finish. We may differ in our experiences in the course of life—we may have more or less of sickness and trouble, we may have more or less of temptation and conflict, but we are all alike in the end. We must all die. How shall we face up to this last inevitability? Some men refuse to think about it at all, but refusing to think of it does not get rid of it. Some again will go through it with a kind of Stoic courage. But that is not the Christian way of meeting the inevitable end. No one can read the New Testament without seeing that the Christians faced the end with a certain triumph. They were not afraid of death—they exulted over it. Jesus had taken death captive and had revealed to them the Father's house on the other side.

Dr. Glover gives three reasons why the Christian faith so completely triumphed over the old paganism. They are these—the Christians out-lived, out-thought, and out-died the adherents of the old pagan faiths. They *out-died* them. Death was a thing of gloom and terror to the average pagan. But they saw these Christians face death in its most appalling forms with faces lit up with smiles of triumph and with songs of praise upon their lips. That is how they conquered that ancient pagan world. They out-died it. Men were compelled to believe in a faith which enabled men and women to go out like that, with drums beating and flags flying.

That is how we ought to face that final inevitability still. I don't know that we always do so. In our funeral services we move rather in the region of the Old Testament than in the sunlit region of the New. You remember how Burne-Jones felt this at Browning's funeral. It was altogether too gloomy for him. 'Much would I have given for a banner or two,' he writes, 'and much would I have given if a chorister had come out of the triforium and rent the air with a trumpet.' Banners and trumpets, Burne-Jones wanted, and he was right! Banners and trumpets are the things that best accompany a Christian's departure—for he goes to be with Christ which is far better.

So we prove the reality of our Christian faith and we help or hinder the progress of our gospel by the way in which we comport ourselves in face of life's necessities.[1]

Second Sunday in Lent.

A Grown Man's Faith.

By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Killermont.

'When my father and my mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up.'—Ps 27^{10}.

When one has come to manhood or womanhood, and then, after long happy years, has lost aged parents, the simple sorrow of the bereavement is keen. A chapter of life is closed. Life is in all sorts of ways poorer.

In the new situation one particular difference makes itself felt. As long as they were alive, parents gave a certain sense of security to life. Whether or not they were really stronger or cleverer than we, they had the authority of experience. They had lived through crises by which we had not been tested and had endured them. 'As one whom his mother comforteth,' says Job, as though there was no consolation like hers. It is true that much that we need is to be had only from the frank company of our own generation; but equally true that something is found only in the constant encouragement and toleration and shelter of a parent's love.

[1] J. D. Jones, *Morning and Evening*, 23.

So when they die a man or a woman feels deprived of a familiar refuge. There is no one any more to whom one can always turn, on whom one can always lean for moral support. Nay, further, a man realizes in new fashion that he himself is now one of the older generation to whom the young look to furnish the stable element and basis of continuity in the changing world. He is in a new relation. Parents were so comforting and adequate. Can he convey the same sense of comfort and adequacy to his children?

Nothing is more definitely established in modern psychology than the inevitability of the impression made on a child by the home atmosphere. The harmony and co-operation and happy relation between parents, or the absence of these qualities in the home background, is always reflected in the development of a child's mind. And any anxiety or fear or sense of insecurity in the mind of a parent, however careful be the effort to conceal it, is sensed by the child in some dim way and may blight its outlook and disposition. Parents must be cheerful and unafraid in their attitude to life if they would have their children fearless too.

The famous preacher John McNeil often used as an illustration an experience of his own youth. As a lad in Inverkip he got work at Greenock, lodging there through the week; and even on Saturdays his hours were long, so that it was past midnight when he tramped the seven miles homeward for his Sunday off. Perhaps there was nothing really to fear, only the dark road was unnerving. But often at the blackest corner he would hear a familiar step. His father had come to meet him, and as his voice rang out, 'Is that you, John?' every fear was banished. Most people can recall some incident in their own early days, or perhaps in later life when they played comforter to their own little ones. How can one justify this confidence of the young?

The question comes at any time to a thoughtful man. In present conditions it presses heavily on the mind. Never was there such universal insecurity. Never did men feel they could do so little for their children. Never was there such need for personal courage, for the serene bravery that reassures and steadies the youthful and the weak. How is man to get it and keep it for himself and pass it on to others? It is up to us to be a source of courage, and there is no one now older than ourselves to whom we can turn. It is we ourselves who have to radiate confidence. We cannot do so unless we possess it.

The only confidence that has any reason in it is confidence in God. Trust like that of this Psalmist who had come to our pass, yet exclaimed, 'When my father and my mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up.' This final faith in God, many people quite recognize, is something that will be required in the hour of death.

> 'When at last I near the shore
> And the fearful breakers roar'

'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,' said Jesus. One dare not have less and need not have more to say. But all the same, admitting this, people feel that that is probably a distant experience, not greatly to be dwelt on, and for to-day and to-morrow they have set their confidence in all sorts of practical arrangements, in time-tables and investments, and insurances and house-purchase schemes. And now all such things are revealed as uncertain shaky structures which might give way any day. Can they give to this experience the interpretation the writer of Hebrews gives to the ancient words of prophecy —'the removing of those things that are shaken that those things that cannot be shaken may remain.' Nothing less than the ultimate faith in God which is required at death is of any use to-day for common everyday life, if it is to be lived bravely and hopefully. When children look to us for confidence, can we make them feel that, if we are stronger than they, it is because even we are not alone and self-supporting, that it has been and still is the experience of our riper years that 'when my father and my mother forsake me then the Lord will take me up.' We can radiate courage and confidence only if we are really courageous and confident, and who can be confident except the man whose trust is in the Lord.

In those days one subject on which any one who has the ear of others feels bound to speak is National Service, urging that no one ought to be content unless he is contributing his utmost effort to the common cause. A nation that has boggled at Socialism and professed to hate Communism has suddenly agreed that private enterprise and gain must just now be entirely subordinated to the general safety and welfare. All profess to accept this. But in connexion with the various organizations that have sprung up to meet the needs of the time some persons stand out as willing co-operators, and others rather hang back and are not ready to do their full share. Now all such service is along the lines of Christian principle laid down in such words as 'ye are members one of another'; 'bear ye one another's burdens'; 'by

love—serve.' As a patriot and as a Christian, let each do his utmost in these days.

There is one bit of National Service however that rests on members of the Church, that is, to hold high the banner of faith. The King in simple and earnest words addressed lately to ministers of the Church of England asked them 'to give to us all the message of encouragement and faith that we so greatly need.' That is indeed the duty of ministers, but also of every member who is a man of faith. Others, younger, weaker, will take their cue from you. Do they see in you a shining faith in God that keeps you serene and steadfast in a trembling world.

What is this faith? It is that God reigns and that His righteousness will triumph. A German saying runs, 'History is judgment' (*'Das Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht'*). The Christian says no. The course of human history is not the final judgment of the Almighty. No ideal development of social or political organization amounts to the Kingdom of God. No victory or defeat amounts to the revelation of the holy Will of God. There is a region beyond history, a realm of the spirit, a Divine order where right triumphs and goodness is blessed, and evil is judged and God is perfectly glorified. From this it follows that the path of duty is the one safe path. 'Man is immortal till his work is done.' And if it is faithfully done God has a welcome for His servant. 'Fear not them that can kill the body and after that have no more that they can do.'

Of this faith Jesus Christ is the pioneer who blazed the trail and took possession of a new country. Some saints and heroes indeed before Him, like this Psalmist, explored the land and sojourned in it. But it is Jesus Christ who made it a habitable dwelling-place for common folk. Come and settle in this region of faith. And if this sure and certain faith is your possession, this grown man's faith, not of a child who trusts his father but of a man who trusts his God, to live up to it and proclaim it is a specifically Christian bit of National Service.

The one certainty in future years is the call there will be for men and women who will labour with patience amidst disappointment, with hope in all sorts of difficulties, with steady confidence that it is worth while to persevere. To prove ourselves such people will require faith in God. Those and those only will be strong to meet every situation undismayed who can say like the Psalmist 'When my father and my mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up.'

Scottish Religious Thought: A Forty Years' Retrospect.

By G. F. Barbour, D.Phil., Fincastle, Pitlochry.

These paragraphs are written at the end of October, just forty years after that morning in October, 1900, when in a great hall temporarily built within the Waverley Market in Edinburgh, the Free Church of Scotland and the United Presbyterian Church joined to form the United Free Church. A vital step was then taken towards the greater union of Scottish Presbyterianism in 1929. Let me say at the outset that the impressions which follow are partial, drawn from memory, not from research. They are the impressions of a boy during the last decade of the original Free Church, the Church of the Disruption, and of a student during the first eventful years of the United Free Church; for I matriculated at Edinburgh University the week before the Union Assembly of 1900. Much is thus left out of this survey, for the thought and practice of the then Church of Scotland are hardly touched on, nor can I do justice to the great contribution which A. R. MacEwen, Orr, and others brought into the Union from the side of the Seceders, for I only came to know it as time went on.

Seven years before the Union Assembly the Jubilee of the Disruption was celebrated, and I well remember the scene in the crowded Assembly Hall as the poet-preacher, Walter Smith, gave his address as Moderator, and the way in which the young folk of the Free Church were taught at this time the meaning of the Disruption, that great and venturous act. In those seven years I saw in

the Moderator's chair Alexander Whyte, Robert Rainy, Macmillan of Greenock, Stewart of Lovedale and Miller of Madras, while among the teachers in the Free Church Colleges in Edinburgh and Glasgow during the same years were Rainy, Davidson, Dods, Bruce, Denney, T. M. Lindsay, Henry Drummond, George Adam Smith, and Alexander Martin. The Church to which they belonged assuredly did not lack leadership either intellectual or spiritual.

By that time the echoes of the Robertson Smith case were fast dying down, and there was a wide intellectual liberty, though charges of heresy, more or less defined, were brought against three or four of those named. Along with an attitude to Scripture that was broadly liberal, save in the Highlands, there went an active spirit of evangelism. The main appeal, as I recollect it in my boyhood, was to heart and conscience, and personal religion was still generally treated as a deeply individual experience. The ideal held before us was that every member of the Church should 'come forward' as the result of a personal decision for Christ. While the form of the gospel appeal was changing (as the address on 'The New Evangelism' published after Drummond's early death bore witness), this fundamental postulate remained. Thus the influence of the Church in the community as a whole was thought of rather in terms of evangelism than of permeation—a fact which probably marked one of the chief differences between the Free Church and the Church of Scotland. The differences due to a divergent view of State endowment are too familiar to need more than a passing mention here. To the great majority of Free Churchmen there was nothing uncongenial in the voluntarism which the United Presbyterians brought into the Union of 1900.

The central place given to personal decision in the Free Church, as I remember it, was less a matter of clearly defined principle than one of atmosphere and ethos. When, in quite recent years, I first heard the phrase, 'a gathered Church,' I at once recognized the underlying idea as closely akin to that in which I had been brought up. Even those who were too young to remember the great revivals—that of 1859 which so profoundly stirred many of the country districts of Scotland, and the Mission led by D. L. Moody in 1874 which had its main effect in the towns and cities—could not fail to be conscious of their after-effects. It was fortunate that the strong humanity and shrewd common sense of Moody saved the profound movement of which he was the leader from fostering the less healthy tendencies of religious individualism. Rather, it helped to reawaken 'that sense of civic and economic duty, by which the older evangelicalism of Wilberforce, Chalmers, and Shaftesbury was so nobly distinguished' (George Adam Smith, *Life of Henry Drummond*, 93). True, even in this awakening a strain of individualism held its place, for the line along which the Churches which united in 1900 mainly attacked the social problem was that of temperance. The need for such an attack on the gravest and most visible defect in Scottish social life was so urgent that it was perhaps natural that ardent reformers did not stop to ask whether drunkenness was not rooted in other social evils and especially in the deplorable housing conditions of the time. The Church of Scotland under the guidance of Charteris, James Paton, and others probably showed more of Chalmers's wide understanding of the needs of the nation, even if they showed less intensity than the Free Church in fighting one outstanding national sin.

In one respect the time at the turn of the century which saw the birth of the United Free Church was like the autumn of 1940. It marked the beginning of a second winter of war; and although the South African War was small, remote, and local compared with the present world struggle, it marked the close of the Victorian period of peace and unquestioned external security—a close of which the great Queen's passing in the following January was but the final and deeply impressive symbol. Thus new problems were arising in international as well as in social ethics, and the minds of the younger men and women were turning to such questions as those of Pacifism and the relation of the 'progressive' to the 'backward' races in the light of Christian principle.

In some quarters this movement towards a wider thought of Christendom and a more corporate sense of Christian duty was checked by a new form of religious individualism. Harnack's *What is Christianity?* (*Das Wesen des Christentums*) had a very marked, though not a long-continued, influence. Its assertion that religion is essentially concerned with the relation of the soul and God, coming from one of the greatest historians and critics of his age, made a strong appeal to many minds; and the dangers of this form of Lutheran subjectivism did not at once appear. But a Church in which the two most compelling voices were those of Whyte and Denney had strong safeguards against both modernist subjectivism and that facile optimism which was crystallized about that

time in a much-quoted phrase of Sir Oliver Lodge's, that the modern man was not worrying about his sins.

To go back to the prevailing thought of the Free Church in the years before the Union. I cannot remember many references in sermons to the distinctively Calvinistic doctrines of Election and Predestination, though these, and still more the thought of Reprobation in the background, still caused perplexity to sensitive minds. It was in the deep sense of personal responsibility and awe in the divine presence that the Calvinist tradition remained as a living influence. Among the more conservative, the test of orthodoxy was rather a substitutionary view of the Atonement than the doctrine of Election. As far as my memory serves, the Reformers were seldom referred to as authoritative in the domain of dogma, though Luther was often quoted (not least by Alexander Whyte) as a master of inward religion, and Calvin as a great expositor of Scripture. Many of the Church's most devout members found the norm of her teaching rather in Rutherford and McCheyne than in the great Reformers.

The chief mark claimed for the Church's teaching was that it was scriptural and above all Pauline. As regards later authorities there was a real reluctance *jurare in verba magistri*, or to accept any post-Biblical authority as final. This comes out in a letter of my father's, written just after Newman's death, which is significant since his own position was on the whole conservative and no man of his generation spoke and wrote with greater enthusiasm of Luther and Knox. 'How false,' he wrote, 'any unqualified admiration sounds from the lips of a Christian man. Saint-worship is a far sadder thing than hero-worship, inasmuch as the saint-worshipper's ideal is so much higher than the hero-worshipper's. "Call no man your father upon earth," has been going in my ears these last days. "Call no man your Master or your Lord." The Speaker knew how very hard it was not to do that; so He said it over to us these three times' (Robert W. Barbour, *Letters and Poems*, 15).

This unwillingness to give unquestioning theological allegiance to any of the great doctors of the Church had as its complement a firm belief in the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who would lead their successors as He had led them, into all needed truth and light. It was with a constraining sense of this guidance that, under Rainy's leadership and following the example of the United Presbyterian Church some years earlier, the Free Church passed its 'Declaratory Act' in 1892; and the sense of liberation which this brought was by no means exhausted when the Union of 1900 was achieved. That declaration ran that 'this Church most earnestly proclaims, as standing in the forefront of the revelation of Grace, the love of God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—to sinners of mankind.' To have said this was to have placed first things first; and it was hardly an accident that this statement was made at the very time when the Student Volunteer Missionary Union was being formed as the forerunner of what later became the Student Christian Movement. In the Glasgow Theological College in the early 'nineties, a group of men, among whom Donald Fraser, Nicol MacNicol, and Harry Miller were outstanding, took the lead in this work; and Miller said not long before he died that his chief impression of that time was of the ardent love to Jesus Christ which was their inspiration to missionary service at home or abroad.

The belief of the United Free Church in the guidance of the Church by the Spirit, and in her duty to modify her statements of belief and the emphasis in her teaching in accordance with that guidance, was expressed in Rainy's saying that a Church must not become the slave of her own history. It was soon brought to a sharp test. After the Union of 1900 the dissentient minority claimed that, in modifying certain views which had been held at the Disruption, and in particular a statement by Chalmers on the establishment principle, the Free Church had forfeited her identity, and so should forfeit the property which she had carried into the Union. After long debate the Scottish Courts repelled this view, and admitted the right of the Church to modify her testimony in non-essentials and herself to determine what was essential and integral to her faith. But on 1st August 1904 the House of Lords reversed this decision, and in effect called on the Free Church to withdraw from a Union which was thus pronounced incompetent.

Of the sequel, theological and financial, to this famous judgment this is not the place to speak, but an utterance which I heard one summer Sunday the year before in the little church at Rothiemurchus may well be recalled. It was in a sermon by Dr. Denney, afterwards printed in his *The Way Everlasting* (p. 273): 'The Church of any given age is an assembly of fallible men; and no one who knows what it is to "begin in the Spirit"—no one who has experienced that deep-reaching, all-embracing emancipation which comes to the intelligence as to the moral nature when the power

of Christ's passion descends into it—can ever identify a law of the Church *simpliciter* with the truth of God. It does not matter whether it issues from Nicæa or Augsburg, from Trent or Westminster. . . . It is a false progress that is promoted by unbending conformity to creeds and confessions. The only way to become perfect is to cherish the initial liberating impulse, to keep our being open to the whole stimulus of Christ, to grow and still to grow in the grace and the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour.'

In the following summer, when the House of Lords' decision had already begun to cast its shadow before, Marcus Dods gave an address at the induction of two young professors, H. R. Mackintosh and J. Y. Simpson, to chairs in New College, Edinburgh. He dealt at length with the same subject and said with all the emphasis at his command that the Confession must be the confession of the Church, not the Church the Church of the Confession': for when the Church ceased to be free in relation to its Confession the latter ceased to deserve its name. It can hardly be questioned that these two great teachers expressed the common mind of their Church at that time.

Many other questions might be touched on, but I shall only try to answer one—Was there a strong sense of the Church and its function in those years to balance the element of religious individualism already referred to? I think a distinction is needed in the reply. In both the Churches which joined in 1900 there was a widespread and keen loyalty to the communion to which their people were proud to belong, and whose past traditions and present activities many of them knew intimately. The charge of narrowness of sympathy could hardly be brought against bodies which carried on so large a missionary enterprise in proportion to their own numbers, and many of whose members showed a keen interest in the smaller Protestant Churches of Europe. As regards missionary interest, it is a rather saddening reflection that the last forty years, which have reduced so markedly the time taken for men, and still more news, to travel from distant lands, have also seen a lessening of the informed and often personal interest which linked the Home Churches to Manchuria, Madras, or Livingstonia. Missionary interest has perhaps become more widespread, but is certainly less concentrated, and geographical accessibility often seems to go with spiritual remoteness.

In this sphere there undoubtedly existed a strong sense of loyalty to the Church and a readiness to make sacrifices for its wider work, but if the question refers to a consciousness of the Church Catholic and an aspiration after its universal fellowship, the answer must be different; for aspirations after visible unity, save in the hearts of a prophetic few like Alexander Whyte, were limited to the Presbyterian family. And when, slowly and tentatively, the desire for a fellowship transcending these bounds began to grow, it arose from a missionary impulse in the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910. To trace its further development, and the difficulties (real as well as verbal) which the conception of an 'ecumenical movement' has to surmount, would carry us far beyond the limits of this article.

So would an attempt to assess the loss and gain of this eventful period of forty years. Perhaps the chief loss is the slackened sense of urgency and personal appeal which was the strength of the older evangelism, though the influence of the Barthian movement and still more the rude discipline of the present war, may bring it back in a new form; and the greatest gain has been the slowly growing perception of what the Church means in the sweep of its universal witness and fellowship. Sometimes in recent years, as I have been confronted by standards of Protestant orthodoxy which were quite unfamiliar in my student days, I have asked myself, 'Am I still a Protestant?' The answer is not perhaps of the first importance: but there are four characteristics then greatly emphasized which still seem to me to lie close to the heart of the Protestant tradition—simplicity of worship, stress on personal responsibility in religion, the constant reference to Scripture as the norm of belief and conduct, and trust in the Spirit as guiding both Churches and individual believers into all truth.

Recent Foreign Theology.

THE latest addition to the 'Mémoires' of the Neuchatel University, namely, *Études sur le Récit du Paradis et de la Chute dans la Genèse* (Neuchatel, Secrétariat de l'Université; fr. 7.50), by Professor Paul Humbert, forms a valuable contribution towards a complex and difficult subject—the critical exegesis of the first two chapters of Genesis. The main object of the author is not to investigate the question of Paradise and the Fall, but rather to point out and emphasize the personal and synthetic conception of the Yahwist redactor who gave these chapters their present definite form. He has naturally avoided any examination of the oral or literary sources, as well as any discussion on the comparative accounts of such early stories found elsewhere in the Near East. On this last point his views agree with those recently put forward by the Dutch scholar, Th. C. Vriezen.[1]

According to Professor Humbert the real personal thought of the Yahwist redactor is expressed in the Paradise story. He regards the Creation legend as a primitively independent one, taken by the redactor from oral, or rather written, tradition, and not altogether in agreement with his views, but nevertheless utilized by him in a subordinate way towards organic unity. It was necessary for the redactor, he holds, to refer first of all to the origin of the world and to point out its primordial state. Hence the description of the *adâmâh*, or 'soil,' which forms the background of the whole picture, and from which the Creator formed a man, *âdâm*, into whom He infused the breath of life—a story which breathes the air of Canaan, and reflects its fertile fields and the agricultural work of its fellahs. By this 'incorporation of the Creation myth' the Yahwist's object was only to stress the puny and ephemeral condition of man, and the great abyss between him and God—a relationship afterwards maintained even more rigorously by the Priestly Code in its efforts towards the same end.

Having thus sketched the background of his account, the Yahwist then superimposed on it artificially his own specific picture—a description of Paradise, a 'Garden of Eden' somewhere in the East. The reader is no longer on the Canaanite *adâmâh*, but is transported to a distant marvellous oasis of verdure, in the midst of which is a mysterious tree, connected with the knowledge of good and evil. God Himself walks there 'in the vesper wind' (Gn 3^{8}), and the introduction of the serpent is intended to discharge Him from all responsibility for man's fall (here Professor Humbert takes the opposite view from Paul Volz, *Prophetengestalten des Alten Testaments*, 1938, p. 87). The Paradise picture shows that, in the thought of the Yahwist, the Canaanite land (*adâmâh*) was under a curse, and that settled life and agricultural work were curse-laden. He thus betrays his nomad origin, and his preference for the careless, happy, undisciplined life of the desert, as adopted by the Rechabites and others (a conclusion also put forward some years ago by Albert, in *ZAW*, 1913, p. 14 ff.). The volume does not end here, but goes on to the Fall of Man and Paradise Lost.

Such is a brief synopsis of the contents, and there is also an excellent chapter on 'The Image of God' (Gn 1^{26}). Although the author does not touch on the documentary theory, the book is thoroughly modern in its scholarship and outlook. It was formerly the custom, in discussing the opening chapters of Genesis, to compare the statements with the up-to-date results of scientific research. But now the theory of a progressive revelation relieves writers from the necessity of any such discussion. In these chapters in Genesis we have an almost scientific account of the Creation and Paradise, according to the knowledge of those early times. Professor Humbert rightly assumes all this, and leaves himself free to deal with the stories themselves as treated by the Yahwist redactor. The volume is simply and clearly written, and will be welcomed by all Old Testament scholars.

J. W. JACK.

Glenfarg, Perthshire.

[1] *Onderzoek naar de Paradijsvoorstelling bij de onde semietische Volken*, 1937.

Entre Nous.

W.R.N.

It is as an outstanding journalist, as a littérateur—'to his facile and burning pen many owe their first entrancing vistas of the treasury of English literature'—that William Robertson Nicoll is best remembered. But it is perhaps as a devotional writer, the Rev. Harry Escott says, 'that Nicoll would have wished to be remembered.' And it is to his devotional books, especially 'The Key of the Grave,' 'The Garden of Nuts,' and 'Reunion in Eternity' that Mr. Escott has turned in preparing a delightful short anthology.

'It is the golden threads of love which gleam through the mingled texture of our human life that sign in it the name of God,' W.R.N. wrote, and from this Mr. Escott gets his title—*God Signs His Name.*

The anthology, excellently bound and printed, appears as one of the 'Wayside Books' (Epworth Press; 1s. 3d. net). In the same series this month there is *God's Troubadour*, extracts from the devotional verse of George MacDonald. Mr. Escott, who is minister of the Congregational Church in the Parish of Rhynie in Aberdeenshire, has prepared this anthology also. On both anthologies Mr. Escott has spent thought and care. We cannot quote from both. In giving a few quotations from *God Signs His Name* we echo Mr. Escott's hope that they will send readers back to their sources.

'They were by the fire on the beach with Christ. That made all the difference. That is the parable of the spiritual life.'

As a passing mirror in the street
Flashes a glimpse of gardens out of range,
Through some poor window open to the heat,
So in our world of doubt and death and change
The vision of Eternity is sweet,
The vision of Eternity is strange.

'He is like one in the valley searching with a telescope whether the wind blows on the mountain top. If he stood there and felt it on his face, he would doubt no more.'

'You remember the sneer about Christians who talked of God as if He were a person in the next street. We are lost if He is no nearer than the next street, lost if He is not nearer than the nearest, nearer than the atmosphere we breathe.'

Do men dare to call Thy Scripture—
Mystic forest, unillumined nook?
If it be so, O my spirit,
Then let Christ arise on Thee, and look.
With the long lane of His sunlight
Shall be cut the forest of His Book.

Family Homespun.

'Frances Balfour's child, Ma'am,' said Lady Salisbury many years ago at Hatfield when she presented the future author of *Family Homespun*, now Blanche E. C. Dugdale (John Murray; 9s. net), to her Sovereign. This child, who leaned from the balcony at Inveraray to hear the ardent talk of grown-up Campbells and their many friends in the hall beneath, who was frequently at Whittingehame in close contact with the 'speculative Balfour mind,' and sometimes at Hatfield where 'respect for the liberty of the individual was too marked a characteristic of Cecil family life to escape the notice of the youngest visitor,' had an upbringing which in every way has qualified her to write memoirs of the most absorbing interest. A highly intelligent child she was, apparently, constantly in the company of her elders, and her book, she says, illustrates the power of family influence upon the individual members of big and united families.

Lady Frances Balfour has handed on her literary gifts to her daughter, whose *Life of Arthur James Balfour* is well known. In the present volume she has given us vivid pictures of many of the 'personalities' of that day. One in particular, Lady Victoria Campbell of the crippled legs and the soaring spirit, played an important part in the life of her niece. She had the passionate interest of her line in ecclesiastical matters, but 'if she pursued some preacher of the "Free" or "Episcopal" persuasion, she did so as an outsider straying from her proper fold.' She 'could not conceive of being a member of any Church but the Established Church of Scotland.' The Balfour mind was not sympathetic to this outlook. Dogma, which loomed so large to her mother's family, was felt quite unimportant in her father's circle. Church distinctions were irrelevant. Arthur Balfour was confirmed in the Church of England, and communicated when in Scotland in Whittingehame Parish Church, and this to him was natural and right. Lady Victoria's enthusiasm was infectious and when her niece, in some pardonable confusion

between the '43 and the '45, asked her aunt 'what exactly happened' in '43, Lady Victoria launched into the story of the Disruption in a manner so brilliant, so lucid, so exciting, that the child lived with her in the very atmosphere of that time and has never forgotten either the points at issue or the emotions they created. Lady Victoria's work among the crofters of Tiree is known, but the difficulties and adventures of her journeys are not often considered. 'Give me hold of a rope and throw my legs after me!' the intrepid woman would call to the boatmen 'who were her trembling slaves.'

The member of the wide family circle most beloved by the younger ones appears to have been A. J. B. They sought to please him and to copy him. He did not offer advice, he did not mete out praise or blame, and he rarely condemned. To pass any moral judgment was unusual in him and his niece can recall only one instance. The name of a relative long dead was mentioned. '"He was wicked," said Uncle Arthur. "I think he was the only really wicked person I ever knew. . . . He was wicked because he hated goodness. He did not fall away from it; he attacked it whenever he met it, especially in a younger person".'

Family Worship.

'On Sunday nights, after dinner was cleared, the bell rang in the courtyard, and five minutes later the gong in the corridor was sounded. At this signal conversation in the library stopped, and everybody went back into the dining-room. There the lights had been put out, except for two gas lamps turned low on one wall, and two candles on a small table in the middle. Round two sides of the room stood the servants, more than twenty of them, white caps and aprons glimmering in the half-light, and Fairy, in her black silk Sunday gown, at the end of the row of capless ladies' maids. At the other end was Mr. Baker [the Butler] heading the line of menservants. When we had walked in and taken our places, they all sat down with one movement. Uncle Arthur [A. J. Balfour] came in last, went to his chair by the table, drew the silver candlesticks closer, and opened the small Bible which he had brought in with him. Sometimes the passage he read had some connexion with the sermon at church. But, whatever it was, his voice compelled you to listen. It was not loud, or dramatic, but no shade of meaning seemed to escape him as he read.

'We all knelt, he read the Collect for the Sunday, and "Lighten our darkness." Then everybody repeated the General Confession and the Lord's Prayer. After the blessing, all stood up, and waited till Mr. Baker got to the door. Then we went back to the library, and conversation was resumed where it had left off. Prayers only lasted about ten minutes, but they were a feature in our family life, perhaps all the more because they were not daily, nor a part of the morning routine of a busy household.'[1]

Dr. Peel on Some Prayers.

The Congregational Quarterly has an excellent variety of articles by distinguished writers, but it is to Dr. Peel's own editorial that we turn. It is always interesting and often provocative. In the last issue he writes first on the 'elementary and jejune philosophy of prayer' among Christian people to-day. 'At Munich time it was distressing to find so many British Christians prepared to thank God for their deliverance from war, without stopping for a moment to ask what the disciples of John Huss, thus handed over to the tender mercies of Hitler and the Gestapo, would think of such a God, or of those whose prayers had wrought such a mysterious "deliverance."

'Then came the epic of Dunkirk. Responsible Christian leaders, who ought to have known better, recounted how, while in June, 1939, the seas were rough, in June, 1940, they were kept smooth *in answer to prayer*, and so hundreds of thousands of our men escaped the dread beaches and the pursuing enemy. It did not occur to them to stop to explain why the Day of National Prayer was immediately followed by the defection of Leopold of Belgium. . . .

'And sometimes, of course, glib and easy talk about answers to prayer becomes unintentionally heartless and cruel. In a vestry on the Sunday after the Armistice in 1918 a deacon rejoiced in the safety of his relatives and declared, "It is in answer to prayer," to receive from a colleague whose sons had been killed, the quiet, and we hope startling, reply which should have been felt as a rebuke, "I prayed too, Mr. X".' . . .

'As an example of prayer at its worst, this effort of the M.P. for Weymouth in 1727 may be quoted: "Oh, Lord, Thou knowest that I have nine houses in the city of London, and that I have lately purchased an estate in fee-simple in Essex; I beseech Thee to preserve the two counties of Middlesex and Essex from fires and earthquakes; and as I have also a mortgage at Hertfordshire,

[1] Blanche E. C. Dugdale, *Family Homespun*, 94.

I beg of Thee also to have an eye of compassion on that county, and for the rest of the counties, Thou may deal with them as Thou art pleased. Oh, Lord, enable the bank to answer all their bills and make all my debtors good men. Give a prosperous voyage and safe return to the *Mermaid* sloop, because I have not insured it; and, because Thou has said, 'the days of the wicked are but short,' I trust in Thee that Thou wilt not forget Thy promise, as I have an estate in reversion which will be mine on the death of the profligate young man, Sir J. L——g. Keep my freights from sinking, preserve me from thieves and house-breakers, and make all my servants so honest and faithful that they may always attend to my interest, and never cheat me out of my property night or day".'

British Ideals.

'The *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, of Vienna,' says the *News Chronicle*, 'on December 13th achieved a little masterpiece on British national character.

'"No other literature," it wrote, "has such masterly descriptions of scoundrels as has the literature of England. Shakespeare's scoundrels, of course, differ from those of Dickens or Wilde. But you will search in vain in any other literature for anything similar to this whole gallery of scoundrels. Only an English poet could have invented Iago.

'"Of almost every other nation one can say that its great literature expresses its ideals. Nothing of this sort can be found in the literature of England, and the reason for its absence can only be that the British feel absolutely no urge towards higher things".'

An Anthology of Comfort.

'In these troubled times,' writes Mr. Sidney Dark, 'it has seemed worth while to put together this volume of encouragement, in the hope that the legion of the troubled and the burdened may be nerved to persistence and a stout heart by being reminded of the goodness of God, the wisdom of the wise, and the fine deeds of those who have successfully climbed the Hill Difficulty and have gone to their reward.' All the extracts in *Lift Up Your Hearts* (Eyre & Spottiswoode; 3s. 6d. net) have been chosen by Mr. Dark because to him they have a special significance. But readers will not find anything new or modern here, in the colloquial sense of the word. The quotations are generally from the Bible and well-known devotional literature. Some idea of the range may be got from the four quotations on the first page. They are from the Psalms, St. Anselm, Milton, and end with Giles Fletcher's four lines:

> Christ is a path—if any be misled;
> He is a robe—if any naked be;
> If any chance to hunger—He is bread;
> If any be a bondman—strong is He!

Miss Dallas Kenmare.

We know Miss Dallas Kenmare best as an essayist. Her subject is poetry, especially modern poetry. We now welcome a small collection of her own poems with the title *Four Words* (Ed. J. Burrow & Co., 125 Strand, London; 2s. net). Some of the poems have already appeared in 'The Poetry Review.' Among those that are now printed for the first time we choose for quotation:

STIGMATA.

Russian Church, London. July 1940.

How came these wounds, these fiery nails burning
into the soul's flesh? . . .

The shadow of a bird flies across the window,
clouds of incense rise in praise to God,
the voices of the choir rise also . . .
'Alleluia!'

Shadow of a bird. . . . Shadow of the Comforter . . .
but the Christ hangs crucified—
once only in Time, perpetually in Eternity,
no end, no respite—always the cruel nails and the
dripping warm blood on the brow—
'Were you there when they crucified my Lord?'
None, none can escape—all are there,
taunting, tormenting, driving new nails into the
sweet flesh—
envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness—
Eternally the nails tear and the blood drips
slow tears of blood shed for the world's relentless
sin . . .

Pour wine of love into the throbbing wounds,
comfort Christ with love—
heal, heal with love the world's malignant ill,
pour, oh pour balm of love on the vast growth
sapping the world's soul,
on the throngs of men still crucifying the Christ.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.